

reenact the laws affecting the establishment of the United States Veterans' Bureau, and that after the hour of 11.30 o'clock a. m. on said calendar day no Senator shall speak more than once or longer than 5 minutes upon the bill, or more than once or longer than 10 minutes upon any amendment offered thereto.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the proposed unanimous-consent agreement?

Mr. ODDIE. I object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. There is objection.

Mr. SPENCER. Mr. President, I desire to call the attention of the Senate to the fact, which I have been thinking of this afternoon as this discussion went on, that 135 years ago to-day George Washington was inaugurated the first President of the United States, and that at that time the aggregate wealth of the United States was only about eight times as much or nine times as much as we are to-day appropriating for our disabled ex-service men; and certainly there is no disposition to curtail that appropriation. The aggregate wealth of the United States at that time I suppose was approximately \$3,000,000,000, and now the aggregate wealth of the United States is over \$300,000,000,000, and the annual amount which we are seeking to raise every year for the Government is substantially as much as the entire aggregate wealth of the Nation when George Washington was inaugurated President.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPENCER. Certainly.

Mr. FESS. I saw a statement from an economist yesterday to the effect that the wealth of the United States had accumulated from 1785 to the present time more than the total accumulation of 40 centuries of all the world before then.

Mr. SPENCER. I have no doubt that is true. It makes an American intensely proud, because when George Washington was inaugurated, as I say, 135 years ago to-day, the area of the United States was 892,135 square miles, and the center of population was 23 miles east of Baltimore. Now the area of the United States is 3,743,448 square miles, and the center of population is about 8 miles southeast of Spencer, Ind. The population increase has been equally as great; for at that time the population of the entire United States was not as great as is the population of five individual States of the United States to-day. The population then was 3,928,214, and the population of the United States to-day, including our possessions, is 117,859,358.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield again?

Mr. SPENCER. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. FESS. The Senator might have said that the population then was only one-half of the population of a single city in the United States now.

Mr. SPENCER. That is quite true; and there are five States in the Union that to-day have a larger population than the entire United States had then.

AMENDMENT OF PORTO RICAN ORGANIC ACT

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I had intended at this point to ask unanimous consent to call up Senate bill 2448, to amend the organic act of Porto Rico, approved March 2, 1917. It is a bill of great importance to the people of Porto Rico. I think it would lead to no discussion; but I have been informed by the Senator from Utah that there was an understanding among Senators that there would be no vote this evening. If that is the case, I do not desire to ask that agreement be broken.

Mr. SMOOT. That was the agreement, Mr. President.

Mr. WILLIS. Then, with that understanding, I will let the bill go over until some other time, though I shall call it up as soon as I have an opportunity.

THE COTTON TRADE (S. DOC. NO. 100)

Mr. DIAL. Mr. President, on day before yesterday the report of the Federal Trade Commission in response to Senate Resolution 262 of the Sixty-seventh Congress was presented to the Senate, and I asked at that time that it be printed as a public document, and permission was granted. I have since ascertained that there are some charts and drawings accompanying the report, and I am informed that special permission will be necessary to have them included. I desire to have them go along with the report, for it is a very important one; and I now ask unanimous consent to have that done.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, what report is it?

Mr. DIAL. The report of the Federal Trade Commission.

Mr. SMOOT. Do they not print their own reports?

Mr. DIAL. I think they have run out of funds.

Mr. SMOOT. That is exactly what I thought; and I object, because the Congress of the United States and the Senate have agreed that they will not print those department

reports. We make appropriations for every department of the Government to print its own reports.

Mr. DIAL. I will say to the Senator that this is a very unusual report. It is a very long report.

Mr. SMOOT. If we let one in, they will all go in. We have fought the matter here for 10 years; and I object, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is made.

Mr. HEFLIN. I ask for the regular order.

RECESS

Mr. SMOOT. Now, Mr. President, I move that the Senate take a recess, the recess being under the unanimous-consent agreement, until 11 o'clock to-morrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until to-morrow, Thursday, May 1, 1924, at 11 o'clock a. m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, April 30, 1924

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O eternal God, Thou art our refuge and strength, and the same yesterday, to-day, and forever. Do Thou lead us to a high plane of Christian faith and life that our influence, example, and service may be for Thy glory and for the good of our country. Warn our people, O Lord, against the heresy that material possessions determine the greatness and permanence of nations. Teach us that we can not dispense with the heart and soul of things and survive. Bless our land more and more that it may fulfill its splendid mission. Lead it to use its unequalled opportunity to bring mankind into living fellowship with Jesus, the Son of the living God, so that the world may know the teachings of His glorified cross. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I present a privileged report from the Committee on Rules.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York presents a privileged report, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 274

Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 5478, a bill to amend an act providing vocational rehabilitation of persons injured in civil employment.

HOSPITAL FACILITIES

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I present another privileged report from the Committee on Rules.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York presents a privileged report, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 275

Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 5209, a bill authorizing additional hospital facilities for the Veterans' Bureau.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER. By unanimous consent the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROBSION] was given permission to address the House for 15 minutes.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Will the gentleman from Kentucky yield to me to make a request?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Certainly.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Friday, immediately after the reading of the Journal, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SANDERS] may address the House for half an hour, and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WINSLOW] may address the House for half an hour, on the subject of the so-called Barkley bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause]. The Chair hears none.

MINE DISASTER AT BENWOOD, W. VA.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, I have asked you to indulge me while I bring to your attention what I regard as a very vital and pressing matter. The country is shocked, appalled, and grief stricken again, and for the eighth time in the last nine months, because of the

horrible mine disaster at Benwood, W. Va. Yesterday and to-day the entire population, about 5,000 people, of that community, with tear-dimmed eyes and heavy hearts, gathered about the Benwood mine opening. Practically every one of them had a relative that was killed in that terrible disaster. My heart-felt sympathy goes out to that grief-stricken community. The other morning something like 110 or 115 men left their homes; went to their work to make a support for their wives, children, and themselves. A few minutes after they entered upon their work an explosion took place that killed every man in the mine at that time.

EIGHT GREAT DISASTERS IN NINE MONTHS

If the Benwood disaster was the only one that had occurred within the last year or two we might be more able to reconcile ourselves. Coal mining is a dangerous and hazardous employment, but we are more horrified when we stop to think that we have had eight of these great mine disasters in this country in less than nine months. It is high time for the whole country, for the Congress and for those in the States charged with the responsibility of providing proper working conditions for the miners, to give this matter most serious thought.

On the 14th day of August, 1923, 93 men were killed in a coal-mine explosion at Frontier, No. 1, Wyoming; November 6, 1923, 27 men were killed in a coal-mine explosion at Glen Rogers, W. Va.; 33 men were killed in a coal-mine explosion at MacClintocah, Ill., January 25, 1924; 36 men were killed in a coal-mine explosion at Lancashire, Pa., January 26, 1924; 41 men drowned in an iron mine at Milford, Minn., February 5, 1924; 173 were killed in a coal-mine explosion at Castle-gate, Utah, March 8, 1924; 24 men were killed in a coal-mine explosion at Yukon, No. 2, W. Va., March 28, 1924, and 111 men were killed in a coal-mine explosion at Benwood, W. Va., on April 28, 1924. I have not mentioned perhaps a dozen or more other coal-mine explosions in various parts of the country within the same period of time in which from 1 to 7 men were killed and from 1 to 35 were injured. There have been killed nearly 500 men and nearly 100 seriously injured within the last nine months by reason of these explosions and disasters. I have not mentioned the great number who have been killed by falling slate, bad air, and in other ways. I have only mentioned the outstanding explosions and disasters.

FIVE TO ONE

The mining of coal in Great Britain, France, and Belgium is more dangerous and hazardous than in this country, yet there are killed in coal mines of the United States nearly five times as many men as there are in Great Britain, France, and Belgium according to the number of men employed. It is obvious that there is something radically wrong in some of the mines of this country. In our haste we are not giving due regard to the safety of the miners and the protection of human lives. What I shall say, of course, is not intended for those coal operators who are giving proper care to the health and lives of the men employed in their mines. I know that a great many coal operators in this country are using every reasonable means possible to safeguard the health and lives of their men; but, on the other hand, I know there are many coal operators that have been and do now disregard safety methods and devices to protect the lives of their workmen, and it is to that class of operators and to those men who work in the mines that do not use proper care to protect themselves and their fellow workmen that I am addressing my criticisms.

COAL DUST AND CARELESSNESS

I think it can safely be asserted that coal dust and carelessness are responsible for seven of these mine disasters of which I have spoken. One of the great authorities on the question of coal-mine explosions stated recently that "coal dust is the cause of all widespread coal-mine explosions." He further asserts "stone dusting" is the only real safeguard against coal-dust explosions. This stone dust is made from limestone and other rocks and is scattered about in the mines. It has been shown that sprinkling will not prevent coal-dust explosions. The British mine operators tested this out. The British Government passed a law which went into effect June 30, 1920, requiring operators of dry-coal mines to use "stone dust," and since that time there have been no explosions in properly "stone-dusted" mines. Stone dust is being used in 60 coal mines in this country with splendid results. The Bureau of Mines has been for some time urging the coal operators of our country to use the stone dust. The Bureau of Mines contends that this is the only real safeguard against coal-dust explosions. Stone dust was not in use in any of the mines in which these recent explosions occurred. We must bear in mind that coal dust is highly explosive and perhaps has as much force as gun-

powder. Coal dust collects on the walls and tops of the entries and rooms of the mines. Some gas, a match, a spark, a live wire, an open lamp may set it off, and when it is set off traverses all parts of the mine where this dust has collected, and it is the coal dust that makes these continuous explosions throughout, with the disastrous results pointed out by me.

BETTER SUPERVISION

I am sure that more adequate supervision by the operating companies and the exercise of greater care by mining employees would eliminate more than half of all accidents. They need to employ more experienced and careful supervisors. I know that many operators under close competition strive to reduce the overhead charges as much as possible in order to compete in the market, but in my humble opinion the saving in the reduction of the number of accidents would in the end more than pay for this additional supervision. We have about 200,000 nonfatal accidents in our mines each year. This means an economic loss of nearly \$40,000,000 annually, but the loss from fatal accidents represents a much greater sum annually. Are we thinking too much of cheap coal and dividends and too little of the health and the lives of the men who work in the mines? The Nation is more concerned in affording proper protection to the health and lives of those who produce the coal than they are of cheap coal or dividends. The operator is entitled to and he should receive a proper and a fair return on his investment, and the miner should receive just and fair wages. The public should always be willing to pay such a price for the coal as will accomplish both of these results, and the operators should see to it that the public does pay a just and a fair price for the coal. The hazards of the coal-mining industry are very great, not only to the miners but to those who have invested their capital. Neither the States or the Nation should permit coal mines to become charnel houses or slaughter pens. Humanity dictates that the States and Nation should see to it that there are fewer widows and orphans produced in our coal mines. [Applause.]

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I yield.

Mr. BLANTON. I notice that one of the 110 men who so unfortunately lost their lives was an inspector, and the bulletin board showed that he had just posted his inspection notice approving of conditions. I was wondering how we are going to stop it when inspectors can not detect these matters.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I am coming to that. The inspector, if this report is true, evidently failed to do his duty. The mine was not safe. All of these explosions that I have referred to are the result of coal dust. Coal dust is highly explosive. No doubt the coal dust had been collecting in the Benwood mines for years. It no doubt was seen, but disregarded. I think it is another case where the operators plainly disregarded the warning from the Bureau of Mines and other experts as to the danger of coal dust. The use of stone dust or plenty of water no doubt would have prevented this fearful disaster.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Yes.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Does the gentleman think there is any failure on the part of any Federal official?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. None that I know of. The Bureau of Mines has been warning the operators and miners of the country. They have sent out the very best information on these subjects, and have conducted schools of instruction throughout the Nation. I am afraid that some of our operators have not followed these suggestions.

Mr. McKEOWN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Yes.

Mr. McKEOWN. Is there any kind of insurance that the employees may have to protect their wives and children?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Most States have workmen's compensation laws, but the compensation in many cases is not adequate. What we want to do is to prevent this loss of life and the making of thousands of widows and orphans. The coal mines must not be slaughter pens, like some have been I have mentioned. The Bureau of Mines of the Federal Government is doing a wonderful work. America can not go on butchering her people as they were butchered at Benwood and at these other mines.

Mr. CHINDELOM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield? I want to suggest that in our State of Illinois we have very efficient legislation now, I think. Does not the gentleman think that this is primarily the duty of the States?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. In the State of Illinois, since their coal mine explosion at MacClintocah, they are using stone dust to prevent these explosions, and I understand with splendid

results. I do not contend that Congress has the power to regulate or provide for the safety of mines. Perhaps this is the duty of the States. Congress has the power and it has exercised that power by creating a Bureau of Mines and by providing mine-rescue stations and mine-rescue cars and by gathering and sending out information that will be helpful to the coal-mining industry and to the business of coal mining. I think Congress ought to provide more funds for this bureau and to enlarge its benefits. It is not trying to run the coal business but it has and can bring helpful suggestions and information to the operators and miners. I am bringing these disasters to the attention of the country again. I want to get the ear of the country, the miners, and the coal operators, and urge the operators to take steps to provide proper safeguards to protect the health and the lives of the men who must go into the mines to produce the coal for the Nation and to provide a living for themselves and their children.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. Just a short time ago there were a hundred people killed in Washington in one building, the Knickerbocker Theater. That is something that the Congress has jurisdiction over.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. That was a most regrettable accident, but that does not justify the killing of hundreds of coal miners. The coal miner, as a matter of necessity, assumes a great deal of hazard. I want to make that hazard as small as possible for their health and for their lives. Every time you kill a hundred or so of men in the coal mines you add to the price of coal to the consumers of the Nation and make a lot of helpless widows and orphans. I represent one of the great soft-coal producing sections of the Nation. We have not had a coal-dust explosion in my section of the country for more than 20 years and have not had any other kind of explosion. I am sure this is because proper safeguards have been employed. Of course, the miner should exercise proper care the same as the operator. In many places unskilled and inexperienced men are employed and are given dangerous tasks.

REMEDIES

There have been so many of these great mine disasters in recent months, I would suggest a conference of the governors of the coal-producing States and those who are charged with the administration of the State mining laws, representatives of the operators and the miners, and representatives of the Bureau of Mines to work out such policies and suggest such State laws as will practically eliminate any of these great mine disasters in the future. Our Committee on Mines and Mining will in a few days begin hearings on some bills, and we invite those to appear before our committee who may have helpful suggestions. These agencies, I am sure, can and will solve this problem. [Applause.]

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

The SPEAKER. This is Calendar Wednesday and the Clerk will call the roll of the committees.

REORGANIZATION OF FOREIGN SERVICE

The Clerk called the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Foreign Affairs I call up the bill (H. R. 6357) for the reorganization and improvement of the foreign service of the United States, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. This bill is on the Union Calendar. The House will automatically resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and the gentleman from Connecticut, Mr. TILSON, will take the chair.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 6357, with Mr. TILSON in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from West Virginia makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. The Chair will count.

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I move that the committee do now rise, and on that motion I ask for tellers.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts moves that the committee do now rise and demands tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts and Mr. ALLEN were appointed to act as tellers.

The Committee divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 3, noes 99.

The CHAIRMAN. On this vote the ayes are 3 and the noes are 99. So the motion is not agreed to. A quorum is present,

The committee refuses to rise, the Clerk will continue reporting the bill.

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PORTER] is recognized for one hour.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes of that time to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, has there been any arrangement made in respect to the time?

The CHAIRMAN. The time is under the regular Calendar Wednesday rule.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. I understand that provides for an hour on a side. Who gets the hour?

The CHAIRMAN. The chairman of the committee gets the hour in favor of the bill.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. I claim the hour against it.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman is against the bill he is entitled to it, but this is a bill on which there ought to be some active opposition.

The CHAIRMAN. We will cross that bridge when we come to it. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, the predecessor of this bill was before the Congress about a year ago. It passed this body by an overwhelming vote, only 27 votes being cast in the negative. We think in the Committee on Foreign Affairs that we have improved the bill in a number of respects in the intervening year. In the course of the discussion a year ago I made a very full explanation of the bill, perhaps wearisomely full. If it is agreeable to the membership of the House, I should prefer to make my remarks this morning, so far as possible, in the form of answers to questions. In other words, I shall welcome inquiries or comments, because I think perhaps in that way will best be brought out the features of the bill that interest or disturb members of the committee.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. HASTINGS. For the benefit of those Members who were not here during the past session of Congress I was going to suggest the advisability of the gentleman from Massachusetts taking a few minutes to make a general statement about the bill, and then later yield to questions.

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I shall be very glad indeed to make a brief general statement.

This bill is a reintroduction of the bill H. R. 17 and embodies the modifications thereto which the Committee on Foreign Affairs found advisable. I should like to call to the attention of the Members of the House the degree of support and sanction which the bill has from those who are best qualified by reason of their information to appraise its value. We have the support of two Secretaries of State for this specific legislation. I have in my hand a letter from former Secretary of State Robert Lansing under date of February 2, 1923, in which he categorically indorses the measure in the strongest possible terms. The testimony of Mr. Secretary Hughes is spread at length in the hearings of a year ago. Again during the past winter he testified before the Committee on Foreign Affairs indorsing the measure. Former Under-Secretary of State Frank Polk, whom the Members of the House who were here during the war period will recall as one of the ablest officials that the State Department ever had, made a special journey from New York to Washington, interrupting his very busy law practice, in order to tell the Committee on Foreign Affairs that he thought this bill ought to pass for the good of the country.

Former Ambassador John W. Davis, a distinguished former Member of this House and an authority upon the foreign-service problems of America, also made a special trip from New York to Washington to indorse the bill. Almost every trade and commerce organization, almost every export organization throughout the length and breadth of the United States, has put itself on record in favor of this particular proposal.

It is interesting to note that the American Federation of Labor also espouses the legislation, because it recognizes that the system which has heretofore prevailed has not been a democratic system; and it recognizes at the same time that a measure such as that now before the House, by broadening the field of opportunity, by broadening the field of selection, will enable a much larger percentage of the young men of America to aspire to become members of the foreign service of the United States.

Mr. McKEOWN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. McKEOWN. After the passage of this bill will it be possible that men of small fortunes, men of reasonable fortunes, can aspire or can fit themselves for appointment to positions in the foreign service?

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. After the passage of this bill, for the first time in the history of the United States, it will be possible for a young man without private means to aspire to this service with the assurance that he will be able to represent the country worthily and at the same time be self-supporting.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Yes.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Along the line of the inquiry made by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. McKEOWN], this bill provides for the possibility of advancement and promotion and appointment to the higher diplomatic offices; but there is nothing in this bill that provides for the payment of the rent and the dwelling and costs incidental to such position. I think that is what the gentleman had in mind.

Mr. McKEOWN. I had in mind this, if the gentleman will yield, that heretofore the greatest thing that has been in the way of the proper representation of the people of the United States abroad has been that these places have been confined by the nature of things to men of large means who are able to accept them. That is no reflection on these gentlemen, but it has called for great sacrifices on the part of many men, and there are many young men and other men in the United States who could fill the places just as creditably.

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I do not mean to suggest that the foreign service after this bill is passed will be a service that will attract the mercenary. It should not be that kind of service. After this bill goes through—and I repeat it emphatically—it will be possible for a young man without private means to maintain himself decently abroad and at the same time to represent worthily the United States. That has not been possible up to this time in the history of the United States.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. That is particularly true with respect to the Consular Service?

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Yes.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. It does not go as far as to provide that ideal in the Diplomatic Service?

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. It aims at it. The ideal, perhaps, is not attainable at home or abroad. Our duty is to go as far as we can, remembering both our own duty to the Government and the obligation of the Government to be worthily represented abroad.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Under the terms of this bill I understand appointments of foreign officers shall be by commission to a class, and not by commission to any particular post, and such officers shall be assigned to posts and may be transferred from one post to another as the interests of the service may require. I want to ask, in that connection, whether those who are appointed to the Consular Service can be automatically transferred from that class to the Diplomatic Service?

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. That is one of the primary purposes of the bill. Up to this time we have kept the diplomatic side of our foreign service and the consular side of our foreign service in two water-tight compartments. There was a theoretical possibility of appointing a diplomat to consular work and vice versa. In practice the interchange was never effected. It was only about 25 years ago that the question of interchangeability became important. It has only been since the time of the Spanish-American War that the United States has become a world power. Before that time, speaking very generally, questions of international politics and questions of international trade were separate and distinct. It was perfectly proper, perhaps, in those days for the Diplomatic Corps, dealing with international politics on the one hand, and for the Consular Corps, dealing with international business on the other hand, to be distinct and to be kept apart in water-tight compartments.

I do not need to remind the membership of this House that to-day all that is over. To-day every question of international politics involves a question of business, a question of expanding or protecting American trade. The old artificial separation between the two sides of our foreign service is just as archaic as ordeal by battle.

Mr. McKEOWN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. And another point before I yield. Since the World War, especially, the conditions which were growing up during the first 15 years of this century have

become accentuated and are to-day very acute. The race for world trade is a rivalry of an intensity which has never been seen before in the history of the United States or of the world. We must be prepared to compete; we must be prepared to go out and get our share of world business. The only way we, as a nation, can be sure of accomplishing our goal in that respect is to be represented by our very best men in the foreign service of the United States. Up to this time we have not universally been represented by our best men, although we have been represented by and large by pretty good men.

The purpose of this bill is to put the foreign service of the United States on such a basis that it can give America the place in world trade and world diplomacy to which it is entitled and to which it can successfully aspire only if the proper instrumentalities are provided.

I will now yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. McKEOWN. I am in thorough sympathy with the statement made by the gentleman. I wanted to know what difference there would be after the passage of this bill with reference to a duplication of work on the part of the representatives of the Department of Commerce in the foreign field and what effect the passage of this bill will have on reducing any duplication of work if any exists.

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. A full answer to that question, which I am very glad to have the gentleman ask, is rather a long one, but I think the question is important enough to warrant its being replied to at some length.

For years in this House we have heard discussions as to whether the Department of Commerce foreign service was not at least in part duplicating the foreign service of the Department of State. I have participated in that discussion a good many times, and I have in the past taken the view that the Department of Commerce foreign service was duplicative. The judgment of this House and of this Congress has been that even though there was some duplication, that duplication was for the best interests of the country. The two services have therefore been allowed to continue.

Within the last month the most important step in this connection that has ever been taken was taken through the medium of an Executive order. Under date of April 4, 1924, the President issued an Executive order with the view of avoiding duplication, with the view of giving unified direction to the activities of the representatives of the Government of the United States in foreign countries, with the view of coordinating the promotion and protection of the commercial and other interests of the United States, and with the view of insuring effective cooperation and encouraging economy in administration. That Executive order, I think, is not very generally appreciated at its full importance throughout the country. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to have the Executive order printed as a part of my remarks, together with the short statement which was issued from the White House when the Executive order was issued.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD in the manner indicated by him. Is there objection?

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Reserving the right to object, why does not the gentleman read it? If it is printed in the RECORD after the passage of this bill, the members of the committee will not have the benefit of it.

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I will read the first few sentences of the Executive order:

The following regulations are hereby prescribed for the guidance of the representatives of the Government of the United States in foreign countries with a view to giving unified direction to their activities in behalf of the promotion and protection of the commercial and other interests of the United States, insuring effective cooperation, and encouraging economy in administration.

Whenever representatives of the Department of State and other departments of the Government of the United States are stationed in the same city in a foreign country they will meet in conference at least fortnightly under such arrangements as may be made by the chief diplomatic officer or, at posts where there is no diplomatic officer, by the ranking consular or other officer.

It shall be the purpose of such conferences to secure a free interchange of all information bearing upon the promotion and protection of American interests.

I am not going to read all of the Executive order, but I renew my request that as a matter of record it be printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The Executive order is as follows:

EXECUTIVE ORDER

The following regulations are hereby prescribed for the guidance of the representatives of the Government of the United States in foreign countries with a view to giving unified direction to their activities in behalf of the promotion and protection of the commercial and other interests of the United States, insuring effective cooperation, and encouraging economy in administration.

Whenever representatives of the Department of State and other departments of the Government of the United States are stationed in the same city in a foreign country they will meet in conference at least fortnightly under such arrangements as may be made by the chief diplomatic officer or, at posts where there is no diplomatic officer, by the ranking consular or other officer.

It shall be the purpose of such conferences to secure a free interchange of all information bearing upon the promotion and protection of American interests.

It shall be the duty of all officers to furnish in the most expeditious manner, without further reference, all economic and trade information requested by the ranking officers in the service of other departments of the Government assigned to the same territory: *Provided*, That where such compliance would be incompatible with the public interest or where the collection of such information requires research of such exhaustive character that the question of interference with regular duties arises, decision as to compliance shall be referred to the chief diplomatic officer or to his designated representative or, in the absence of such officers, to the supervising consular officer in the said jurisdiction. All failures to provide information requested as hereinbefore set forth shall be reported immediately by cable to the departments having jurisdiction over the officers concerned.

With a view to eliminating unnecessary duplication of work officers in the same jurisdiction shall exchange at least fortnightly a complete inventory of all economic and trade reports in preparation or in contemplation.

Copies of all economic and trade reports prepared by consular or other foreign representatives shall be filed in the appropriate embassy or legation of the United States or, where no such office exists, in the consulate general and shall be available to the ranking foreign representatives of all departments of the Government. Extra copies shall be supplied upon request by the officer making the report.

The customary channel of communication between consular officers and officers of other departments in the foreign field shall be through the supervising consul general, but in urgent cases or those involving minor transactions such communications may be made direct: *Provided*, That copies of all written communications thereof are simultaneously furnished to the consul general for his information. It shall be the duty of supervising consuls general to expedite intercommunication and exchange of material between the Consular Service and all other foreign representatives of the United States.

Upon the arrival of a representative of any department of the Government of the United States in any foreign territory in which there is an embassy, legation, or consulate general, for the purpose of special investigation, he shall at once notify the head of the diplomatic mission of his arrival and the purpose of his visit; and it shall be the duty of said officer or of his designated representative, or in the absence of such officer then the supervising consular officer, to notify, when not incompatible with the public interest, all other representatives of the Government of the United States in that territory of the arrival and the purpose of the visit and to take such steps as may be appropriate to assist in the accomplishment of the object of the visit without needless duplication of work.

In all cases of collaboration, or where material supplied by one officer is utilized by another, full credit therefor shall be given.

CALVIN COOLIDGE.

THE WHITE HOUSE, April 4, 1924.

STATEMENT ISSUED BY THE WHITE HOUSE WHEN THE FOREGOING ORDER WAS MADE PUBLIC

It is the purpose of the Executive order herewith promulgated to establish in the foreign service of the United States the basis for a coordination of effort in advancing American economic and commercial interests which will eliminate unnecessary duplication of work and encourage representatives of this Government in foreign countries to cooperate more fully in the accomplishment of their respective missions. The order does not modify the existing functions of the several executive departments, nor will it affect any changes hereafter made in these functions by subsequent act of Congress. As originally proposed it applied only to relations between foreign officers of the Department of Commerce and the Consular Service. In its perfected form it is reciprocal in nature and all inclusive in scope, placing alike upon all representatives of this Government abroad the responsibility to assist their colleagues of the foreign service in the performance of all regularly assigned duties.

It may be appropriately stated that the regulation of interdepartmental relations in the foreign field as herewith ordered is in harmony with the effort now proceeding through the Bureau of the Budget

and the Joint Congressional Committee on Reorganization to realize a balance in administrative relations which will conserve the public funds. It is confidently expected that in effect this regulation will give purposeful unity to the activities of this Government in foreign countries, and in so doing will give additional impetus here at home to the endeavor being made to practice intelligent economy in public expenditures through coordination of the work of the several executive departments.

In this matter the Executive has had the friendly and most helpful counsel of Members of the Congress acquainted with the practical phases of administrative problems in the foreign service.

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. It is interesting to note that before the issuance of the Executive order various departments of the Government—and there are a number of them which have agencies in the foreign field—cooperated in agreeing upon the text and terms of that order.

The other day we passed in this House a bill introduced by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KETCHAM] establishing and giving an organized status to the agricultural attachés who are sent forth by the department in Washington to take care of agricultural investigations and inquiries throughout the world. There is at present on the calendar a bill introduced by my colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. WINSLOW], of which the number is H. R. 7034, and which is a bill to establish in the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce of the Department of Commerce a foreign commerce service of the United States, and for other purposes. That bill is to give legislative recognition to the foreign commerce service of the United States. Up to this time the foreign agencies of the Department of Commerce have been very largely dependent upon items in appropriation bills. I think it is safe to say, gentlemen of the committee, that when the Ketcham bill, when the Winslow bill, and when the bill which is now before the House have become law, we shall for the first time in our history have a well-rounded, well-conceived, and efficient fighting machine, fighting for the best interests of the country abroad in the realms of international trade.

It is a rather remarkable thing that though this country has been in existence something like 140 years, there has never been but one act put through Congress providing a general reorganization of the foreign service. That law was enacted in 1856, nearly 70 years ago.

Mr. Wilbur J. Carr, who is the director of the Consular Service and who is also the budget officer of the Department of State, is well known to a great many Members of this House, and is beloved and respected, I think, by all. In the course of the hearings upon the bill he said this concerning the measure:

The second measure in all the history of this country in relation to the foreign service, and by far the most important and most far-reaching, is this measure which you have before you. There has not been anything like it since the Government began to exist. In my judgment, if you enact it you have a bill which will furnish the basic structure of the organization for your foreign service for 50 years, a bill on which you can build any kind of a foreign service you please, a bill on which you can provide for ministers and ambassadors, secretaries, and consuls, in the light of what you believe to be responsive to the opinion of the country. I do not think I can stress too much the importance of this bill being enacted into law.

I should like to suggest—and, of course, this is an important consideration in these days when economy is demanded—what the cost involved in this measure is.

In the first place, I wonder if Members of the House generally realize that the foreign service of the United States is nearly, and frequently completely, a self-supporting service. On page 5, of the report on this bill, you will find the situation as of the fiscal year which ended June 30 last. The expenditures for the foreign-service establishment amounted in that year, the latest year, of course, for which we have complete figures, to \$8,435,000. The receipts from the foreign service amounted to \$7,981,000. The net cost of the service, the net amount which must necessarily have been defrayed from the Treasury of the United States, was thus less than one-half million dollars.

Mr. CELLER. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Just one more point and then I will be glad to yield.

I have just been furnished the figures for the first half of the fiscal year 1924; that is, the figures for the period which ran from July 1 last until January 1 last. I find that the consular receipts this year are coming in at the rate of eight and a half million dollars, as compared with \$6,800,000 for the last fiscal year. If this showing is maintained, it will mean, of course, that the technical deficit shown for 1923 will be

wiped out. Thus, for the year 1924 the foreign service of the United States will be maintained without a single cent of appropriation or of burden upon the taxpayers of the United States. In fact, it will show more than a million-dollar profit.

I yield now to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. Will that condition obtain after you have set up your pension fund and have taken into consideration the deficiency because of that pension fund?

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Yes, indeed. I shall be glad to discuss the pension fund in a moment.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. LONGWORTH. What was the amount of the passport charges?

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The passport fees for the year ended last June 30 were \$1,144,000. They were very much larger than the previous year.

Mr. LONGWORTH. The passport and visé fees.

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Yes; both the passport and visé fees were larger.

Mr. CRISP. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CRISP. I would just like to ask my friend how much will be the initial increase in the salaries of the Consular Service if this bill is enacted into law?

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The present salary scale for the Diplomatic and Consular Service combined is \$2,311,600. The proposed salary scale is \$2,807,100. The apparent increase is thus \$495,500. To be deducted from this, if the House shall so decide as a result of this legislation, would be the current appropriation of \$150,000 for post allowances, which the House may think should properly be deducted if a reorganization of salaries goes through. In the event that post allowances are deducted, then the actual increase in salaries involved in this bill is \$345,500 a year.

As I was on the train last night I picked up a newspaper describing a large coast-defense gun which is now on its way from Watervliet Arsenal, N. Y., to its emplacement in Boston Harbor. I find that that one gun with the carriage and the emplacement will cost something like \$2,000,000, four times and more the annual cost of giving us what will be the best foreign service the United States has ever had, instead of the service of to-day, which is merely a pretty good foreign service. I am not underestimating, I am sure, the value of the coast defenses of the Nation. We must have proper defense, but, gentlemen, in my judgment, if you can give us the best foreign service that the country can provide, you are doing a lot more toward peace insurance than you are by multiplying munitions of war. [Applause.]

I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. McKEOWN. This revenue or income is derived from fees charged for services rendered by the department?

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Yes.

Mr. McKEOWN. Can the gentleman tell us whether the other services of the other departments derive any income at all from their services?

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. In the foreign field?

Mr. McKEOWN. Yes.

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. There is very little work done by the other branches of the Government for which fees can be charged. The gentleman will remember that the foreign service of the Department of Commerce is only 10 years old; the foreign service of the Department of Agriculture is still more recent. The Consular Service, since the foundation of the Government in 1789, has been the primary agency that represented the American business men abroad, both the exporter and the importer.

Mr. McKEOWN. This just emphasizes something I have contended for in the House, that there are many departments here in Washington, in addition to the State Department, that render service to private individuals for which there ought to be some reasonable charge.

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I have no doubt that is true.

I have spoken earlier in my remarks of the importance of interchangeability from the standpoint of the service and its smooth and facile operation. I should like to speak of it also from the standpoint of the young men who enter the service.

Up to this time, I repeat, the two sides of our foreign agency have been kept entirely distinct and apart. A young man just out of college would go into the Diplomatic Service, oftentimes, because he liked the work; oftentimes because he liked the kind of play he thought might develop from that particular occupation. He went, I say, direct from college. He never had the first instincts of a business training. He never knew anything

about how a consulate was operated. He often got a somewhat warped idea of his own importance. He would be fêted and made socially much of in the foreign capital to which he was assigned. He would lose his sense of values and his perspective.

What are we going to do under this bill? Every young man, when he is originally appointed to the unified foreign service is going to be sent to a consulate. He is going to be sent to Singapore, perhaps, or to the West Coast of Africa or to some point in the Transvaal or to Saigon. He will not find social opportunities awaiting him in those cities. He will rather find an opportunity for the hardest kind of hard work. He is going to get an experience and an education that will be valuable to him and his country all his life. He will be a better public servant because of the practical training the bill will give him that he has never had before.

Mr. KING. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I will.

Mr. KING. It has been a constant mystery to me how all these places have been maintained for the sons of rich parents as a general rule. Will the bill open up the foreign service for people who have no money?

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. This bill, for the first time in the history of the United States, will make the service available for the poor man.

Mr. HILL of Maryland. Is it not true that no man except those of independent means could heretofore afford to accept a place in the service?

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. That is true of the diplomatic side. A man on the consular side could support himself in a proper way without private means. The gentleman from New York can perhaps answer that question better than I can.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PORTER. I yield the gentleman five minutes more.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Section 14 provides that the State may assign officers to duty in the Department of State. Did the committee consider the desirability of requiring officers after serving abroad to serve 1 or 2 years at home every 5 or 10 years?

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. We have a new provision in the bill which I hope will meet with the approval of the committee. It embodies the gentleman's suggestion. It will be found in section 15:

That the Secretary of State is authorized, whenever he deems it to be in the public interest, to order to the United States on his statutory leave of absence any foreign service officer who has performed three years or more of continuous service abroad.

Our notion in committee was that it was important to the individual after he had served a certain period abroad to have an opportunity to come home, but that it was vastly more important to the country that the man should come back so as to get first-hand information from and about America, and also so as to give American business men the benefit of the things he had learned during his service abroad.

Mr. CELLER. In other words, a man is more or less affected by the color of his surroundings.

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. It takes a level-headed, hard-headed man not to be influenced by his environment. We want to bring every foreign service officer back to the American environment every so often for the sake of the country.

Mr. CELLER. I know the gentleman's time is short, but will he not say something about the pension question?

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. There never has been a retirement system for the foreign service. We retire our Army officials and our Navy officials. We retire our judges. We retire all these three services without exacting any contributions from the beneficiaries. We retire the civil-service employees of the Government, but we exact 2½ per cent from these men out of their annual salary. In this bill we say that the principle of retirement is so firmly established in this country in almost every other Government activity that there seems no reason why we should not extend it to this additional realm of Government activity.

We say this—and in my judgment it is too niggardly, but we wanted to present a bill that would certainly meet with the approval of the House—we say to the foreign service men, "You must contribute 5 per cent of your salary." I think the analogy of the foreign service officer to the Army officer and to the naval officer is much more complete than to the civil-service employee in Washington.

The foreign-service officer is going hither and yon about the world, giving up fixed places of abode, often rendering difficult and hazardous service of prime importance to the United States.

Yet we say that we will not treat him as we do the Army and Navy, which are upon a noncontributory basis. We will not do for them what Great Britain does, by retiring her foreign-service men on two-thirds pay without exacting contributions. We will not even do what we do for the civil-service employees of the Government in requiring them to pay but 2½ per cent. What we do for the foreign-service officials is to take 5 per cent of their salary; but on the other hand—and I think you will agree that we could not do less—we remove the artificial provision which provides a maximum annuity of \$720.

Mr. CELLER. You make the retiring age 65 years?

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Sixty-five.

Mr. CELLER. And the clerk in Washington in the field service is retired at 70 years of age?

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. There is added a provision that the Secretary of State may retain any man for five years if he finds it wise for the country so to retain him.

I call to the attention of the gentleman the fact that the kind of service which these men must render involves going to the Tropics; it involves very difficult and unsettling changes in the mode of life. The consensus of opinion was that the country was better off to retire them, as a general rule, at 65. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. COLLINS rose.

The CHAIRMAN. Is the gentleman from Mississippi opposed to the bill?

Mr. COLLINS. I am.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi in opposition to the bill.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Chairman, I am always more or less reluctant to oppose my colleagues on the committee, but in this instance I can not see my way clear to join with them in support of this measure. This bill does not confer upon the Secretary of State any additional power except to increase the salaries and emoluments of these officers. There is no power that is given in this bill, except to grant pay increases, that the Secretary of State does not now possess. In order to let you know the extent of these pay increases so that you may determine whether or not you are willing to grant them, the bill provides that the clerks in embassies are given a maximum salary of \$9,000 a year. Consuls general of a certain class are likewise given \$9,000 a year.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLLINS. Let me finish my statement first. The existing salaries of clerks in embassies range from \$2,500 to \$4,000 per annum. This bill increases the salaries of these clerks so that in the future they will range from \$3,000 to \$9,000 per annum. In other words, there is an increase of more than 100 per cent in some of the salaries.

The bill is framed more in the interest of diplomatic employees than consular. There are two consuls now who receive \$12,000 a year, and there are others who receive \$8,000 and on down to the minimum of \$2,500 a year. Of course, increases are granted to consular employees, too, but not to the extent granted to diplomatic clerks. It is a pay increase bill, and that is all there is to it.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLLINS. Not now. That is not all it does for this foreign force. It gives them a retirement allowance with a maximum of \$5,400 a year—not beginning with those who are to serve 10 or more years in the future, but providing that a man can retire at the present time, if he has served a given length of time, and can begin drawing this \$5,400 a year as a retirement allowance for the rest of his natural life, without having paid anything for this pension. You gentlemen know where this is going to lead. You know there will not be an employee in any of the departments of the Government who will not contend for similar retirement allowances in the future. If we are willing to open the doors and grant such retirement allowances, well and good; but as for me, I am not going to vote for them.

Do you realize that certain clerks in certain embassies will draw more salary than a United States Senator or a Member of this body? I have not yet reached the point where I think a clerk in an embassy is more valuable to this Government than a Member of the House or a Member of the United States Senate, nor that some of them of a lower order termed "cookie pushers" by Minister Hugh Gibson are worth from \$6,000 to \$8,000 per year to us.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLLINS. Not now.

Mr. KING. What is a cookie pusher?

Mr. COLLINS. He is a cake eater. That is not all that these young gentlemen will receive under the provisions of this bill. This does not fully satisfy them. They are given what is termed a "representation allowance." A representation allowance is very much more than a post allowance. Any sort of expense that can be imagined can be listed under the head of representation allowance. Let me read to you what Mr. Carr's definition of representation allowance is, page 156 of the hearings:

A representation allowance is an allowance which has its origin in the practice of foreign Governments. It may cover furniture and furnishings for the official residence and the rents of the officer's residence. It may cover entertainment; it may cover an allowance for receptions on the annual 4th of July celebration; it may cover an allowance for expenses for official entertainment given to officers and commanders of our fleets when they visit foreign ports; it may cover various outlays which the head of the mission or a consulate makes in properly representing his Government.

I noticed a few days ago where the price of a court uniform, including the short trousers commonly worn in some of the embassies of Europe, is \$640. Under this bill our ambassador can pay for such uniforms.

Mr. CELLER. Are those golfing trousers?

Mr. COLLINS. No; I think they are called "spoofing" trousers. It may be said that this representation allowance goes to the head of the mission. This is not the case. It is worded so as to take care of any expense whether incurred by the head of the mission or by a clerk in the mission. He can spend it in any way he pleases, he can allow a part of it to his clerks if he desires, he can spend it himself. Throughout the hearings there runs the suggestion that ambassadors, ministers, and clerks should be allowed representation allowance.

We now come to the question of the increased cost to the Government as a result of this salary bill. Mr. Hughes testified that the additional pay of the men now in the service would be \$495,000—page 15 of the hearings. In addition to this the retirement allowance will ultimately reach the amount of \$504,000 per annum—page 120 of the hearings. The cost of representation allowance will be the full amount that these gentlemen will be able to get the Appropriations Committee to grant them. It will increase, as we know, as the years go by. Therefore we will have to begin with an approximate increase of about a million and a half dollars a year in salaries and perquisites. I do not believe such increases are warranted.

Some one said something about the character of these young men and that only the sons of rich men can get these diplomatic places. It has been testified in the hearings that in these examinations a thorough inquiry as to the ancestry of the applicants is made in order to find out the eligibility of the person applying.

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I wish the gentleman would read the passage to which he refers.

Mr. COLLINS. I shall certainly do it. Mr. Wright, on page 52 of the hearings, said:

They must possess that peculiar adaptability, breeding, character, personality, education, intelligence, poise, and common sense which I suppose one might consider as a rather broad definition of diplomacy.

Of course, all this does not refer to the Consular Service.

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The gentleman would not conclude from Mr. Wright's testimony, I am sure, that there was any question of pedigree involved.

Mr. COLLINS. Let me read on and see if there is:

In other words, he has to establish with the Department of State sufficient bona fides as to his reputation and antecedents, and we look closely into it by various ways after the designation to take the examination. He then takes the examination.

This is on page 60.

Another instance:

Because in the majority of these instances we have some of our more confidential means of examination to follow up each individual and find out what his or her antecedents are.

This is on page 60 of the hearing, Mr. Wright still testifying.

Mr. KING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. COLLINS. I do.

Mr. KING. I am very much interested in that phase of the gentleman's speech. I was just wondering if the younger son of General Wood, who has recently gone to Paris and who previously made several million dollars on the stock exchange,

and who last week entered the races in France, will have a chance to enter the foreign service? I wonder if he would be considered as a capable man to represent us abroad?

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I want to ask the gentleman if he is not confusing antecedents and ancestors? Of course those are entirely different.

Mr. COLLINS. Perhaps the gentleman remembers the full statement made by Mr. Wright.

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. "Antecedents" goes no further than any prudent employer would require.

Mr. COLLINS. These words are synonymous used in this way, but I think the gentleman understands what Mr. Wright means.

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I do.

Mr. COLLINS. Now, gentlemen, this bill increases the salaries of these young men in the Diplomatic Service to an extent very much larger than those employed in any of the other departments of this Government. These salaries are greater than those paid some of the best men occupying exalted positions in Washington.

The sponsors of the bill say we want interchangeability between the Consular Service and the Diplomatic Service, and that is their excuse for these salary increases.

This right of interchangeability exists now. But imagine placing a consul in a diplomatic clerkship! He is unfitted for such a place, and hence there will be no such transfers. And it is hinted throughout the hearings by Mr. Gibson and others that transfers would be very unwise. If we do have any, they will be few and of little consequence.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLLINS. Yes.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. I would like to ask the gentleman if he has personally visited many of our consulates to see the caliber and class of young men who are serving in them?

Mr. COLLINS. Yes. I have visited a great many of them. I have nothing to say about the gentlemen in these consulates. If this bill dealt entirely with consuls and consuls general, I perhaps would favor the provisions for increased salaries. But this bill is not in the interest of consuls and consuls general. It is in the interest of clerks or secretaries in the embassies. That is all there is to it.

Mr. TABER. Does the gentleman mean by "clerks" the secretaries to embassies?

Mr. COLLINS. Yes; clerks, counselors, and so on.

Mr. TABER. The men next to the chargé and ambassador?

Mr. COLLINS. That is the counselor.

Mr. TABER. And the secretary of the embassy is next in charge.

Mr. COLLINS. The secretary comes next to the counselor.

The CHAIRMAN. The time indicated by the gentleman has expired.

Mr. COLLINS. I yield myself five more minutes.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLLINS. Yes.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Does the gentleman mean to say that it is possible to-day, under the present regulations of law, for these young men in the Consular Service, where there are very splendid young persons of education, ability, and force—that it is possible for them to be appointed to diplomatic positions such as secretaries of legations?

Mr. COLLINS. It is the testimony of witnesses appearing before the committee. Officials of the State Department testify that this bill gives the Secretary of State no powers that he does not now possess. See Mr. Gibson's testimony on page 22 of the hearings. Also on page 101. He and others who testified should know. Anyway, I am assuming that they do.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. My understanding is that the main purpose of this bill is to tone up the Diplomatic Service.

Mr. COLLINS. It is "to tone it up" by toning up their pocketbooks at the expense of the American people, and that is the only way the service is toned up.

It is testified by everyone that came before the committee that the Consular Service and likewise the Diplomatic Service of our country is the best of all of them. Only one witness made an exception, and he testified that England's service was perhaps equal with ours. Now, if our service is the best—and that is the preponderance of the testimony—why is it necessary to change it? And will this bill make it better? I doubt seriously if an increase in the salaries of these gentlemen will improve the service. And that is all this bill does. There is not a feature of the bill, including the retirement feature, but is written in behalf of the man in the service. All questions of doubt are resolved in favor of him, and none in favor of the

Government, and all are at Government expense. If we voted ourselves similar benefits it would defeat nine-tenths of us.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLLINS. Yes.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Is it the policy of the Government to pay these young men so that they will be fitted to become diplomatic officers? And if so, is it not necessary to give them decent salaries?

Mr. COLLINS. Yes; but there are thousands of clerks in this city that do infinitely more work than do the clerks of missions that do not receive one-third the salary these men will receive; and the mere fact that they happen to be stationed in a foreign country where we can not see them is no reason why we should prefer them over those that we do see every day.

Mr. KING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLLINS. Yes.

Mr. KING. I was much impressed by the statement of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Rogers], where he said this was the first bill that ever came before the Congress that will give a meritorious young man a chance to get into the foreign service. Will you explain how that is made possible under this bill?

Mr. COLLINS. There is not a syllable in this bill that will change the present method of selecting consuls and secretaries in embassies and legations.

Mr. CELLER. Is there not a provision made for a basic or starting salary of \$3,000 instead of \$2,000, and is not that an inducement for a man in more humble circumstances to enter the service?

Mr. COLLINS. Well, if you believe the way to tone up the foreign service of this Government is to more than double the pay of some in it and otherwise raise the pay of all of them, then it will be your duty to vote for this bill, because that is what it does.

Mr. CELLER. In addition to a feature not adverted is there not the additional feature of retirement under which a man who has been in the service many years can realize that when he gets old and gray in the service he will be able to retire on a pension?

Mr. COLLINS. As a Member of Congress I would like to be able to retire on a pension, but I will not vote for one for Members of Congress.

Mr. CELLER. I think we ought to be able to retire on a pension if we are here long enough.

Mr. COLLINS. I am not in favor of giving a clerk in an embassy \$1,500 more in salary than a United States Senator or a Member of this House and in addition giving him a retirement allowance of \$5,400, and a representation allowance, too.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The increase of salary is 21 per cent and not 100 per cent, as the gentleman stated.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself one minute more in order to answer that statement. The maximum salary paid clerks in the Diplomatic Service is \$4,000 per annum. This bill fixes the maximum at \$9,000 per year. This is more than 100 per cent increase. The increases in bulk, according to Secretary Hughes, in salaries alone, are \$495,000.

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. That was last year's testimony and has been corrected.

Mr. COLLINS. No; it is in this year's testimony. If the gentleman will turn to page 15 he will find this statement made by Secretary Hughes:

Under the proposed combined service the 641 officers will receive a total of \$2,807,100, which, you will see, is about \$495,000 increase.

This testimony was given January 14, 1924.

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. But the gentleman has not checked off the post allowance to which I called attention in my remarks.

Mr. COLLINS. But the post allowance will be more. Representation allowance includes post allowance and the representation allowance is a larger and broader term, and hence appropriations will be increased to take care of this added expense. [Applause.]

Mr. LINTHICUM. Will not the gentleman yield himself one minute in order that I may ask him a question?

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself one more minute.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I notice on page 5 of the report that the Diplomatic Service receives \$2,360,000 plus and the Consular Service \$4,978,000 plus, making a total of \$7,338,000. Now, the total increase under this bill is \$345,000.

Mr. COLLINS. I do not admit that.

Mr. LINTHICUM. The gentleman may not admit it, but that is a fact. Now, then, if you will take 5 per cent of the \$7,300,000 you will get just about \$345,000, so that the salary increase at the utmost is not more than 5 per cent.

Mr. COLLINS. Well, Secretary Hughes, in the statement I have just read, says the salary increase is \$485,000. Mr. ROGERS has just admitted the increase is 21 per cent. I contend that it will be infinitely greater than this.

Mr. LINTHICUM. But from that you take \$190,000 for post allowance.

Mr. COLLINS. No; only \$150,000 is now appropriated for the post allowance, and this bill provides for a representation allowance, which is a broader term and covers more subjects than post allowance. Post allowance covers only a difference in exchange rates.

Mr. LINTHICUM. They have always had that.

Mr. COLLINS. No; it was started during the last war.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MOORE].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee: I do not expect to take 10 minutes in discussing this matter. I discussed it quite in detail in February of last year, when the bill was then under consideration; and it is necessary for me to attend a meeting of a special committee very soon, which will prevent me from remaining here.

But there are just two or three observations I would like to make. The whole purpose of the bill is, somebody has said, to tone up our foreign service, but I prefer to say it is to strengthen and invigorate our foreign service. That is the only purpose which existed in the mind of the committee which reported the bill and that is the only purpose which can exist in the minds of any of the advocates of the measure so far as I know.

This country is in many ways dependent, as we all know, upon a proper representation of our Government abroad, and we should desire to make that representation as satisfactory as possible.

There were elaborate hearings, as gentlemen have said, before the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and there was no contest among those who appeared as to the propriety of doing what we have in view as proper to be done. On the contrary, as has been said, men of great distinction, and men of less distinction who have more practical knowledge, came before the committee and urged that the bill be favorably reported. I wish to quote an utterance, a very striking utterance, made by one of the outstanding men of the country, for whom I have personally the highest admiration and respect; a man who has always served successfully in the positions which he has occupied and who will serve successfully in any positions to which he may possibly hereafter be called. I refer to Mr. John W. Davis.

Mr. Davis appeared before the committee, not to accomplish any selfish end, but to give the committee the benefit of the experience which he acquired while ambassador in London in contact with consular and diplomatic officials. Not to quote him at length, I confine myself to one specific utterance of his relative to the foreign service. He said:

Speaking generally, of course, the diplomatic branch of that service is the first line in the country's defense, and the Consular Service is the spearhead of the country's trade.

The design of the measure is to make the Consular Service and the Diplomatic Service as effective as is possible. There are many things of importance we are called on to deal with, but is not that a matter of major importance in view of our widening relations with other nations and in view of the fact that so much of our future prosperity and happiness depends upon maintaining the right sort of relations with other nations?

So far as the expense is concerned—and the expense seems to be the thing which is troubling some Members—the bill increases the total salaries to the extent of \$345,500 annually. Further, it provides an initial payment of \$50,000; the Government is to contribute nothing more to the retirement fund for 20 years, and at the end of 20 years may make a contribution of \$48,000. Even so far off as 1965 the total expense to the Government on account of retirement payments will be only \$260,000. And bear this in mind, that as shown by the record of the past—and we can predicate upon that a prophecy for the future—with the extension of our foreign business the fees that will accrue to our officials located in foreign countries will increase, so that in all human probability in the near future it will be found that the entire service will be as self-sustaining as the Post Office Department.

Mr. CELLER. Will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. I will, yes.

Mr. CELLER. I recall a statement of the gentleman wherein he expressed some hesitancy about this bill because of its retirement feature. I presume you have now cleared up your doubts on that score and I would like to ask where these figures come from. Were there any actuaries figuring out the retirement provisions with reference to the contribution to be made by the Government?

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Yes; Government actuaries worked upon the matter and the committee had the benefit of their statements. I do say, frankly, to my friend, that I had doubts about making the retirement payments as large as they are, but I have waived those doubts for several reasons, and one reason, as I stated a moment ago, is that I think the entire liability on that account is going to be taken care of by the fees collected by our officials who serve in diplomatic and consular offices.

Mr. CELLER. Were the consular agents and the diplomatic officers consulted with reference to the 5 per cent contribution? That is a very large contribution.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. They were not consulted but the fact is that so far as I know, and I get my knowledge very largely from publications in which they are interested, this bill has their approval, notwithstanding the fact that the 5 per cent payment exacted of them is 2½ per cent in excess of the payment made by the Lehlbach law.

Mr. PORTER. If the gentleman will yield, may I say for the information of the House that this bill has the unanimous approval of all the men in the foreign service.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. A great majority of this House the other day—I did not happen to be included in the majority—said, "We wish not only to relieve suffering, but to put ourselves on a better footing with one particular foreign nation by making a gift of money to the people of that nation."

The House voted \$10,000,000 for use in Germany. It will take a long, long time, it will be a long road to travel, before the increases that are provided by this measure will ever total that amount.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. I yield five minutes more to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Will the gentleman give way for one question?

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Certainly.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Is it not the real purpose of this bill to start the men at a somewhat higher salary and give them a somewhat higher salary throughout their career, so as to attract to this unified service a grade of men who will probably be better fitted for the two functions of consular officer and diplomatic officer?

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. That is true. Mr. Davis in his testimony says that young men continually came to him at his office in London and asked whether they should remain in the foreign service, and he always inquired as to their pecuniary condition. We want to cut out the necessity of that by paying men fair salaries and fairly assisting them after they are compelled to retire.

Just one further suggestion. Everybody knows that our principal competitor among the foreign nations is Great Britain. Everybody knows how at this time we are endeavoring to build up and maintain a merchant marine that can successfully compete with Great Britain. This bill in dealing with the Diplomatic and Consular Service will merely approximate what Great Britain has found necessary in order to carry on her business with other nations. If this bill is passed, still the Americans will receive lower salaries than the Englishmen who serve their country in other countries. If this bill is passed the retirement provisions will be less liberal than those that are made for the Englishman. The Englishman who enters the foreign service receives a larger retirement allowance and is not required to make any contribution to it; and the law of England does one thing that is not contemplated here, namely, it makes special provision for the men of that nation who serve in countries where climatic conditions injuriously affect their health so that they are compelled to forego any active work.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Of course, to my distinguished friend.

Mr. BLANTON. The distinguished gentleman from Illinois, Mr. Cannon, served the country faithfully in this House on this floor for 44 years.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. And he is now at home, making his own living, without a single dollar contributed by the Government toward his support. Why are these people entitled to more consideration than Uncle Joe Cannon?

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. And the men who are on the retired list of the Army and Navy are given allowances which our eminent friend, Mr. Cannon, does not enjoy, and in order that this Government may function properly; that it may not break down; that we may hold up the institutions which our fathers have created, the law has established retirement allowances for the civil employees of the Government.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. I will.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Has the gentleman made any estimate of the cost of its representation allowance, or the probable cost of that per year?

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. I will say to my friend that post allowances are made now, but are not proposed by the bill. The bill carries a general provision for representation allowances.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has again expired.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. I yield the gentleman one more minute.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. I think, Mr. Chairman, that this bill, which has been considered more carefully than any bill that has come before the Committee on Foreign Affairs during my membership on that committee, is altogether in the right direction, and I trust that so far as its main object is concerned, at least, it will receive the approval and the support of the House. [Applause.]

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LINTHICUM].

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman, I am very much in favor of this bill. I believe it is the greatest step we have made in our Diplomatic and Consular Service in many years.

I feel that the very fact that we are consolidating the Diplomatic and Consular Service into one class will do more to democratize this service than any other one thing will do. It provides that the men shall be appointed to a class and not to any particular position. It provides that they can be changed from one post to another, that a man who has shown great aptness and ability as a consul may on recommendation by the department as fitted for a minister be so appointed. It provides that men may be transferred from the Diplomatic Service to the Consular Service and vice versa; in other words, it puts this entire foreign service in one class, to be known as "the foreign service" of the United States.

We all know just what the Diplomatic Service has been and what the Consular Service has been. It is no secret that there has been no commingling of interests. We know that members of the Diplomatic Service are invited to functions to which a man in the Consular Service could never hope to aspire in a lifetime. But under this bill the man who is a consul to-day may become a minister to-morrow. Under this bill a man who is secretary in the Diplomatic Service may be in the Consular Service to-morrow, and so these offices are interchangeable from the diplomatic to the consular and from the consular to the diplomatic and the whole service is democratized, and for that reason is more accessible to the people.

I heard the speech of the gentleman from Mississippi in which he said there was a great increase in salary. I find by looking at the report that the total cost of the Consular Service and Diplomatic Service amount to \$7,300,000. And the total increase, after you deduct \$150,000 now appropriated for host allowances, amounts to \$345,000. In other words, just about 5 per cent increase in expense to the Government.

Now, I am sure that every member of this committee is very anxious that we should have the very best foreign service of any nation in the world. I am sure that you would like to equal the salaries of our greatest competitor, Great Britain, if it were possible to do so. And yet all down the line we find Great Britain is giving far more to her consuls and to her diplomats than we are giving, in many instances twice as much. The consequence is that she is forging ahead with her great world commerce.

Mr. TEMPLE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LINTHICUM. I yield.

Mr. TEMPLE. If I understood the gentleman correctly, he inadvertently overstated the salary. In the report on page 5 the total salaries of the Diplomatic and Consular Service amounts to \$2,807,105.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I was talking about the total expenses, and I take it from page 5 of the report.

Mr. TEMPLE. The total expenses and not the salaries?

Mr. LINTHICUM. Yes.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LINTHICUM. I will.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I have been very much interested in the merchant marine. It has developed before the Merchant Marine Committee and also the special committee of which I am a member that the matter of developing the foreign trade very largely depends upon an efficient commercial or consular agent in the foreign markets. Does the gentleman think the development of the foreign service will have a tendency to increase commercial enterprises abroad?

Mr. LINTHICUM. I believe the adoption of this bill will establish our foreign relations upon a different basis and give us a greater and more efficient and more enduring service abroad which must benefit our foreign trade.

What I mean by more enduring is this: We have provided for retirement, and by doing so a man can enter the foreign service and he knows that that is his life's work if he so desires. He can have it until he is 65 years of age, and if he has performed 15 years' service he can retire with a substantial allowance. So I believe that while young men now enter the service and continue therein a certain time and then have to do what many Members of Congress are compelled to do, leave the service and go back home in order to provide for a competency, with this retirement feature they know that in the years to come they will have a retirement competency upon which to live. For this reason they will continue in the service and make it a life work, a more enduring work.

The gentleman from Texas has just mentioned our good friend Uncle Joe Cannon. There is no one in the House who would not like to see him receive a retirement sum if it did not involve retirement features for all Members of Congress. But I heard on the floor of this House when the gentleman from Texas was talking against an increase of salary which might have helped him—I heard Uncle Joe get up and say that he was opposed to increasing the salaries because he thought it was unwise.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LINTHICUM. I will.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman is mistaken about the increase. If he will look at page 5, the increase in this bill is \$241,500 for salaries for the Consular Service increase, and \$254,000 in the Diplomatic, making a total of \$495,500, but they say if we abolish the post allowance that will take off \$150,000. If they abolish the post allowance they are authorizing the Appropriations Committee to make a representation allowance with the blue sky as the limit.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Oh, I think the Congress can take care of any blue sky limit on the question of the representation allowance. The intention of this bill is to discontinue the \$150,000 post allowance, and thereby reduce it to about \$345,000 additional expense. I was speaking a moment ago about the salaries paid by Great Britain, and she is no more able to pay competent salaries than is the United States. Certainly we owe a competency to our men in the foreign service. Take the matter of ambassadors and ministers. The ambassador of the British to Portugal receives \$19,466 a year, while the United States representative receives only \$10,000. The British ambassador to Uruguay is paid \$20,439 as salary and the one from the United States is paid \$10,000.

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a comment there?

Mr. LINTHICUM. Yes.

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The British foreign service costs between eight and nine million dollars per year, whereas at the present time ours is operating at a profit.

Mr. LINTHICUM. The gentleman from Massachusetts is quite right; besides I think the foreign service is worth every dollar that you spend upon it. It is the great market-producing service of any country.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LINTHICUM. In a moment. Our farmers are suffering to-day. Why? Because we have not sufficient foreign markets. I believe that if we encourage this foreign service, give them efficient men and sufficient salaries on which to live, give them retirement which guarantees a competency when they are too old to work, that these men will go out and get the trade for the United States, and the trade in our foreign markets will rapidly increase. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman spoke of Great Britain paying \$20,000 to a representative in Uruguay.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. Possibly that is why she asked for sixty-odd years in which to pay her debt to the United States, and if she would pay a little more attention to what she pays out in expenses, she would not have to ask for so much time.

Mr. LINTHICUM. That is a question, and carries an insinuation, that any gentleman might ask, but there is no basis for it, of course. Great Britain has sixty-odd years in which to pay this enormous sum of \$4,000,000,000. Possibly she did that because she did not want to discontinue any of her great activities, and it is true that many countries during the war, with the tremendous expense that they were under, never neglected those things upon which the nation depended for its trade and commerce.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LINTHICUM. Yes.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. In addition to the salaries paid, does Great Britain allow to her ambassadors and representatives a representation allowance?

Mr. LINTHICUM. Oh, yes; every country practically does that, and Great Britain allows more as a retirement fund than we do under this bill.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Does she allow enough to pay the entire expenses so that a representative does not have to go into his own pocket as ours do?

Mr. LINTHICUM. I think that is a matter which depends very much on the particular individual.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Is it the idea of this proposed law that the Government will pay the necessary expenses of our representatives in foreign countries hereafter?

Mr. LINTHICUM. It is the intention to pay the necessary expenses, but the amount of money that a man spends depends very largely on himself. Take the case of a Member of Congress. Some men entertain and some men do not, and their expenses necessarily vary.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. In the statement of Mr. Davis in your report, I read that he said that his necessary expenses were something like \$50,000 when he represented us in London. Is it the idea that under this bill such expenses would be paid?

Mr. LINTHICUM. Oh, no; those expenses must be within reason and subject to congressional appropriations. The ambassador gets \$17,500 under this bill just the same as he does now, but of course no man can represent the United States at the Court of St. James as he should upon the salary which the United States pays him. If he did, it would be extremely poor service.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Is it contemplated under this bill, with this authority, that the Government will take care of those expenses?

Mr. LINTHICUM. The Government will take care of some of them, but it would not take care of all of them.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Yes.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. If the gentleman will permit, representation allowances are authorized under the bill so that it would depend somewhat upon the Committee on Appropriations. That committee could appropriate any amount that it saw fit.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Of course the committee could, but Congress does not divest itself of the right to appropriate or refuse appropriations.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. I suggest that, because the gentleman from Nebraska asks the question, and I thought he should receive the information.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Congress can do it now, if it feels so disposed.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Oh, no; there is no authorization for it.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. It seems to me that that is a matter which very much needs to be corrected, so that our representatives may be reimbursed for the necessary expenses they have to incur. I hope that under this bill that will be the fact.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Under this bill Congress can appropriate the money to meet the necessary expenses.

Mr. McSWAIN. In other words, it is the idea of this bill to make it possible for a poor man, if he has the brains and character, to go over there and represent the Nation.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Absolutely, and if he is in the Consular Service the idea is that he can be promoted to the position of minister. Now, as to the retirement, I do not believe the retirement feature is really going to cost this country anything,

because, as the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MOORE] said, after the first appropriation of \$50,000 made in the bill, then there will be no further necessity for appropriation for 20 years, and then probably about \$48,000. I believe that the increased business that the Consular Service will bring will more than take care of its total expense, including the retirement fund.

It almost does it now. It takes care, within \$400,000, of all the expenses of the service, and, I think, with all the traveling public and with the increase of business the service will develop to a sufficient extent to take care of all the expenses, including the retirement feature, before it becomes a charge upon the Government.

When we realize the importance of our foreign service not only in our relations with other nations in diplomatic matters but also the importance of our trade relations through which we can build up a large foreign trade, thereby helping to dispose of the products of our farms and factories, it is difficult to realize how little interest is taken in the subject in comparison with those matters nearer home.

We have recently established a very satisfactory retirement system for our civil employees in this country, and yet there is great opposition when we attempt to establish such a system for those of the foreign service, who are separated from their homes in America, sent to foreign fields and shifted from place to place, thereby preventing them from either establishing a permanent home or making those necessary savings for old age.

I feel that if we can establish our foreign service on a basis of satisfactory salaries, with representation allowance where deemed advisable, and then afford them retirement with a competent fund, we will not only draw good men into the service, realizing it would be a life work in the interest of the Government, but we will also build up such a system as will not alone reflect great credit upon our country but at the same time great markets for our products.

I have shown that the increase in salaries is extremely small, and I hope I have demonstrated that the service itself within the next few years will provide all the funds necessary not alone for the present service but for all additional expenses incurred under this bill. We have charged the salaries of members of the foreign service 5 per cent, to be paid into the retirement and disability fund for annuities, refunds, and allowances. At such a high rate of payment this fund will rapidly increase and after the appropriation of \$50,000 authorized in this bill, will not likely cost the Government anything for the next 20 years.

This has been figured out by expert accountants, and I append their statement, giving full particulars of the cost to the employees of the foreign service and the eventual cost to the National Government:

FOREIGN-SERVICE RETIREMENT SYSTEM

Statement showing estimated annuities payable to foreign-service officers under the proposed retirement system prior to the year 1945 which will be paid solely from the contributions, with interest thereon, of such officers

Fiscal year ending June 30—	Annuities payable during year	Available retirement fund from contributions with interest compounded at 4 per cent	Balance after payment of annuities	Necessary appropriation
1925.....	\$61,176.41	\$143,719.85	\$82,543.44	\$50,000.00
1926.....	71,791.67	229,405.80	157,614.13
1927.....	80,866.60	307,343.20	226,476.60
1928.....	86,633.43	378,873.36	292,219.93
1929.....	93,260.35	446,654.93	353,394.58
1930.....	97,131.26	510,257.20	413,125.94
1931.....	101,759.09	572,762.10	471,003.10
1932.....	111,163.40	632,812.27	521,848.87
1933.....	116,355.09	685,406.97	569,051.88
1934.....	120,925.29	734,502.58	604,577.28
1935.....	141,951.55	771,268.00	629,316.95
1936.....	149,410.66	796,989.63	647,578.97
1937.....	164,715.13	815,902.13	651,267.00
1938.....	179,978.65	819,817.68	639,839.13
1939.....	199,987.14	807,932.70	607,945.56
1940.....	212,814.00	774,763.38	561,949.38
1941.....	232,009.55	726,927.36	494,827.81
1942.....	248,431.01	657,120.92	408,689.91
1943.....	265,266.43	567,537.51	302,271.08
1944.....	308,209.60	456,861.92	148,652.32
1945.....	346,050.10	297,008.00	48,951.69

The salary increase will amount to about 14 per cent over the present salaries paid, but this will give to the service a stability the value of which can not possibly be estimated. At the present time the salaries are so low that men finding it impossible

to exist under present conditions and being fully equipped through their service with the Government are compelled by reason of their financial condition to enter the employ of private individuals and corporations, thereby depriving the Government of those very men who were educated in the service and who have become so valuable.

Individuals and corporations may continue to outbid the Government on a question of salaries, but, through the retirement system, the increase of salary, the advantages of educational and social features of the foreign service, I believe we will be able to hold our men and that they will feel satisfied to make this their life work, thereby affording the Government men of exceptional training, ability, and experience.

It is not my desire to increase salaries except where it is found necessary and where other governments have found it to their advantage to pay a salary adequate to the service rendered. I have said that we should like to treat our men as well as our greatest competitor, Great Britain, but we are not compelled fully to do that at this time. While we have under this bill increased salaries, we have not yet by great odds provided as much as Great Britain. For the benefit of comparison I have appended the following statement:

Comparative statement showing salaries of ambassadors and ministers at important posts

	Great Britain	United States
Cuba.....	\$19,012	\$12,000
Czechoslovakia.....	19,466	10,000
Denmark.....	21,899	10,000
Egypt.....	158,398	7,500
Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania.....	18,006	10,000
Finland.....	18,735	10,000
France.....	180,297	17,500
Germany.....	138,932	17,500
Great Britain.....	19,466	10,000
Greece.....	19,466	10,000
Italy.....	138,932	17,500
Japan.....	129,199	17,500
Mexico.....	14,599	17,500
Netherlands.....	124,332	12,000
Norway.....	21,899	10,000
Panama.....	15,572	10,000
Persia.....	24,332	10,000
Peru.....	18,102	17,500
Poland.....	27,252	12,000
Portugal.....	19,466	10,000
Rumania.....	19,466	10,000
Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes.....	18,979	10,000
Siam.....	14,599	10,000
Spain.....	129,199	17,500
Sweden.....	21,899	10,000
Switzerland.....	118,248	10,000
Turkey.....	142,581	17,500
United States.....	197,330	10,000
Uruguay.....	20,439	10,000
Venezuela.....	14,599	10,000

¹ Residences owned by Government and supplied in addition to salary.

This comparison does not alone apply to the Diplomatic Service, but likewise to the Consular Service of the two countries, and for that reason I append statement showing salaries paid by these two great nations to their principal consular officers, to wit:

Comparative statement showing salaries of principal consular officers at important posts

	Great Britain	United States
Argentina:		
Buenos Aires.....	\$11,922	\$8,000
Rosario.....	7,907	3,500
Austria, Vienna.....	6,325	3,500
Belgium, Antwerp.....	9,246	4,500
Brazil:		
Bahia.....	8,394	4,000
Para.....	9,124	5,000
Rio de Janeiro.....	12,166	8,000
Chile, Valparaiso.....	11,679	5,500
Denmark, Copenhagen.....	6,569	5,500
Ecuador, Guayaquil.....	6,812	5,500
France:		
Bordeaux.....	6,447	4,500
Havre.....	6,569	5,500
Lille.....	6,325	4,000
Lyon.....	6,569	5,000
Marseille.....	9,246	5,000
Paris.....	9,246	12,000
Germany:		
Berlin.....	9,002	6,000
Cologne.....	9,002	4,500
Hamburg.....	8,759	4,000
Munich.....	6,325	2,500
Great Britain, London.....		12,000

Comparative statement showing salaries of principal consular officers at important posts—Continued

	Great Britain	United States
Greece, Athens.....	\$6,325	\$5,500
Italy:		
Genoa.....	9,246	5,500
Milan.....	9,246	5,000
Naples.....	9,246	5,000
Palermo.....	6,447	4,000
Mexico, Mexico City.....	8,273	5,000
Netherlands:		
Amsterdam.....	6,325	5,000
Rotterdam.....	9,246	8,000
Norway:		
Christiania.....	6,569	5,500
Bergen.....	6,325	4,500
Paraguay, Asuncion.....	6,813	4,000
Poland, Warsaw.....	6,447	6,000
Portugal:		
Lisbon.....	6,325	4,500
Lourenco Marques.....	8,515	3,500
Rumania, Bucharest.....	6,447	5,000
Russia:		
Moscow.....	9,246	5,500
Petrograd.....	7,664	13,500
Spain:		
Barcelona.....	9,246	5,500
Madrid.....	6,447	2,500
Sweden:		
Goteborg.....	9,246	3,000
Stockholm.....	6,447	8,000
Switzerland:		
Geneva.....	6,325	3,500
Zurich.....	9,246	8,000
Turkey:		
Constantinople.....	8,759	8,000
Beirut.....	8,759	4,000
Smymna.....	8,759	5,500
United States, New York.....	26,035	

¹ Office now closed.

I look upon this bill as a great step in advance for another reason: It has heretofore been almost as difficult for a young man to enter the Diplomatic Service and continue therein without having private means of his own or private means accessible as it is for the scriptural "camel to go through the eye of a needle," owing to the expense and the low salaries. The State Department has been compelled to so inform applicants who wish to enter the service. The Consular Service has had to refuse applicants who were married, because the salary of deputies and clerks was not sufficient to maintain them. A deplorable situation for a country like the United States to say the least.

The increase provided in the bill with the representation allowance will enable men of brain and ability who are without private means to represent the United States as well as those men who have private means. [Applause.] Furthermore, the progressive action taken by Congress in the provision of legation and consular buildings in the various countries provides a home and offices for the representatives of the United States, which is another great adjunct to the service. [Applause.]

When I came to the Sixty-second Congress, which convened in 1911, I, together with other gentlemen, constantly advocated the purchase of embassies, legations, and consular buildings in the various countries of the world. I am pleased to say that we have received much support and attained great success in the movement. The United States at that time owned but two embassies, that in Constantinople, Turkey, and Tokyo, Japan. It owned several legations and two consulates. It now owns many embassies, legations, and consulates, as shown by the following table:

Embassy, legation, and consular buildings owned by the Government

Embassies	Legations	Consular
London, England. ¹	Pekin, China.	Shanghai, China. ¹
Santiago, Chile. ¹	San Jose, Costa Rica. ¹	Seoul, Chosen.
Constantinople, Turkey.	Habana, Cuba. ¹	Tahiti, Amoy.
Tokyo, Japan. ¹	Panama. ¹	Yokohama, Japan. ¹
Paris, France. ¹	San Salvador, Salvador. ¹	
Rio de Janeiro, Brazil. ¹	Bangkok, Siam.	
Mexico City. ¹	Tangier, Morocco.	
	Christiania, Norway.	

¹ Building purchased since the beginning of the Sixty-second Congress.

² The Embassy building in Tokyo, and consulate building in Yokohama were destroyed by the recent earthquake, and an appropriation for rebuilding is being requested.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Maryland has expired.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] use some of his time?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 20 minutes.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, no man on earth could discuss this bill in five minutes. The committee admits that in salaries alone this bill is giving an increase of \$495,500. It admits that in the report. But they say they are taking off some post allowances, and they say they are merely authorizing Congress to grant a representation allowance. I want to ask the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROGERS] how could the 400 Members of Congress, if they wanted to, stop the representation allowances after the Committee on Appropriations had brought it in here in a bill? Gentlemen, just try it some time. Just one of you new Members try it; try to change an appropriation bill that has been framed across the hall yonder and brought in here by that committee. You can not do it.

Here we have about 40 Members present on this House floor now. In considering a \$24,000,000 bill yesterday we had at one time only 16 Members on the floor. You let one of us get up here and offer an amendment to strike the representation allowance out of the bill brought in by the Committee on Appropriations, and you will see the chairman in charge send in to the cloakroom after the rest of the 35 members of that Committee on Appropriations, and they stand together like the rock of Gibraltar, fighting for their bill, and they will not let you change it at all. They will not let you strike out one word of it. Try it some time. I have tried it. The only way you can strike any of it out is by a point of order when it is unauthorized legislation. Then you talk about Congress allowing it. Congress will allow just exactly what the Committee on Appropriations puts in that bill.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Did we not at the last session increase the Army appropriation bill over \$20,000,000 for rivers and harbors?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; but that was when you formed a combine on the committee, and the committee made rather a straw fight on it then. Only a few of us really fought against it. It was a good deal like other fights I have seen here on the floor—straw fights.

I know where the main increases in appropriations are made—in the other body. We never send one appropriation bill away from here but what it comes back with several million dollars added to it. That is where the big increases are made. But as to this bill, no man here and no man on the committee can tell what extra it will cost this Government. As to the annuities, there is a difference of about \$500,000 between the idea of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] and that of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROGERS], one claiming one figure and one claiming another. And who knows how much the Committee on Appropriations is going to allow on the representation allowance? Nobody knows.

I am amused every time a Member of Congress gets up here, week after week, and talks for the farmer, for the agriculturist, saying that we must do something for them. We have not done a thing worth while for them this year. As to that petition which the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DARROW] put into this Record, that petition coming from 350,000 farmers, demanding that we stop raising salaries, demanding that we stop increasing appropriations, demanding that we cut down the expenses of the Government, there has not been a bill passed here that complied with the demands of those farmers. I want to say to those farmers right here—because you can not reach them through the newspapers—that in every bill that has been passed on this floor in this Congress so far this Congress has turned down their demands. It has raised salaries, added new employees, and increased expenses in every bill that we have passed up to this time, and it seems we are going to continue to raise salaries on every bill that comes up, because we can not get enough men to vote it down. But this bill ought to be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield me two minutes more?

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. I yield the gentleman two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for two minutes more.

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. Why do you not introduce a bill for the benefit of the farmers? You say so many have been introduced. Why do you not introduce one yourself?

Mr. BLANTON. There is not a single day that passes but finds me in my seat here and on the floor fighting for these farmers' petition to reduce expenses.

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. Why do you not introduce a bill yourself?

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, a bill. They do not ask us to introduce a bill. They do not want a bill. They just ask us for one thing, to cut down expenses, and that is what I have been fighting for; to reduce expenses.

I want to say to the gentleman from Wisconsin that if he wants to help the farmer he can help him by doing just one thing: Cut down his expenses and give him a market. That is all he wants.

Why did not this bill become a law in the last Congress?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. In just a moment. I want to discuss this bill. It passed this House on the 8th day of February, 1923, in the last Congress. They had from the 8th day of February until the 4th day of March to pass it in the Senate. If it is such a good bill, why did they not pass it? Those Senators over there knew that it was a bill that the people of the United States did not want, and they let it die on the calendar.

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The gentleman knows why it did not pass. There was a filibuster on the shipping bill.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman ought not to interrupt me when I have only a minute. This bill ought to die again on the calendar this time.

Twenty men here could stop the passage of this bill if they would get up and fight it; if just 20 of you would stand up here and fight this bill, you could stop its passage; but you will not do it. You sit down there and let it pass, and it is probably going to pass this evening. But we ought to kill it and stop this everlasting increase of salaries and governmental expenses.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, how much time have I remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has five minutes remaining.

Mr. PORTER. I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SHREVE].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for two minutes.

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I am strongly in favor of the passage of this bill. There probably never has been a time in the history of our country when our Diplomatic Service, when our Consular Service, and all the other services we have in foreign countries needed strengthening so much as they do at the present time, for the reason that all the countries of the world doing business everywhere have already begun to reorganize their consular, their diplomatic, and their foreign services. The result is we are in direct competition with all the countries of the world.

We are seeking a market in the old countries of the world for our surplus farm and manufactured products. There was a time when we could get along without those markets; there was a time when we were self-sufficient and when we could consume all we could produce, but that time has passed. The World War has changed conditions entirely in this country. Other nations are now changing their foreign policies, are adopting new systems, are becoming vigilant and active in the countries with which we are doing business, and if we are to continue the commercial supremacy of the United States, to which we are so justly entitled, we certainly must be aggressive.

This department has not been reorganized in the last 100 years. I happen to handle the appropriations for this department, and the thing that amazed me all the way through was the low salaries. The gentleman speaks about the increase; it is a mere bagatelle. When you compare it with the great work that is being done by these departments I am satisfied you will pass the bill and pass it without any hesitation. It is right and it is just; it is the one thing that the United States needs at the present time.

We have never been properly equipped in foreign countries. We are to-day adopting some of their systems, particularly the

system of finding and securing business in foreign countries. Our commercial attachés are going abroad and they are finding business everywhere. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. ROGERS].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Hampshire is recognized for three minutes.

Mr. ROGERS of New Hampshire. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I desire to state my approval of this measure for the following reasons: In listening to the witnesses who came before the committee to discuss this proposition I was convinced that there were two facts standing out very clearly as established. In the first place, it is manifest, from any study given to these matters, that a reorganization and a rehabilitation of our foreign service is most desirable if we are to continue our foreign service on the high plane of the past and if we are to maintain an American foreign service which shall be equal to that maintained by any nation in the world. Secondly, Mr. Chairman, I believe there is an even more important reason why this bill should pass. From the very foundation of the American Government we have boasted of the fact that any American citizen, no matter how poor he may be, if he has ability and a desire to make good, is given the opportunity to work his way up and to enter into the ranks of any office within the power of the country to bestow. We have boasted of the fact that any poor man in America, no matter how humble his parentage, may have the opportunity, if he has the ability and the brains, to take his place as the governor of any of our sovereign States, as a Member of our national legislative body, and even become President of the United States. Yet it must be said, to the humiliation of every patriotic American citizen, that under the present law as it exists to-day no poor, honest, humble American citizen, no matter how much ability he may have, and no matter how much he may desire to enter the foreign service of his Government, can be admitted to take his place in the foreign service of this country unless he has independent means. If this bill passes it will no longer be necessary when any young man in America who is about to finish his course in a school or college desires to enter the foreign service of this country and make that his life work and when he submits himself to the State Department to be accepted for the foreign service to inform him that he can not enter into the honorable foreign service of this country unless he has sufficient independent means to enable him to support himself, and to give him an opportunity to go into foreign countries he must have such means, otherwise he can not serve his country in its foreign service. To obviate this disgraceful situation and to make it possible for the young Americans engaged in our foreign diplomatic service to receive a salary on which they can live, I hope this bill may pass. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Hampshire has expired.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, how much time have I remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. Seventeen minutes, and the other side has three minutes remaining.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, this bill is one that in some respects meets with my approval, but it contains some features that I think should be eliminated.

I want to take this occasion, however, to take issue with my good friend from New Hampshire [Mr. ROGERS] who has just spoken, when he says that be it to the humiliation of the American people at the present time it is impossible for a man who is poor, no matter how worthy, to enter the foreign service. That is not true, gentlemen. I do not charge that that statement was made willfully, but I do charge that the gentleman is in error.

Mr. ROGERS of New Hampshire. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Yes.

Mr. ROGERS of New Hampshire. I desire to state my authority and call the attention of the gentleman from Texas to the fact that my remarks were based on the testimony of the Third Assistant Secretary of State, Mr. Wright. If the gentleman will pardon me, I would like to quote his statement. Mr. Wright said that when application is made for service in the foreign service, "We inform them that at present it is necessary for individuals to have some private means."

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. In the Consular or Diplomatic Service?

Mr. ROGERS of New Hampshire. In the Diplomatic Service.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. I grant you that, and I heard him say that.

Mr. ROGERS of New Hampshire. I just wanted the gentleman to understand the source of my information.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. I disclaim any intention to say that the gentleman from New Hampshire willfully made a misrepresentation. I heard Mr. Wright make that statement, and while I have a very high regard for Mr. Wright I deny that Mr. Wright is reflecting any credit on himself when he says that as an official of this Government he tells a young man in advance that he can not consider him for a diplomatic secretaryship unless he possesses private means. That is not the law. That is a department-made ukase.

The statement of Mr. Wright does not refer to the Consular Service, and the term "foreign service," as used by the gentleman from New Hampshire, comprehends both the Diplomatic and the Consular Service.

Let me now tell you something about the Diplomatic Service. This bill, so far as the Diplomatic Service is concerned, only deals with the secretaries of embassies. They are a very small part of the foreign service, a very insignificant part, as to numbers, but when it comes to the Consular Service it is full of men to-day who are poor and who have no other means of livelihood except their salaries. I know some of them personally. I know a young man who received a position in the Consular Service some years ago, partly through my instrumentality. He is now attached to the consulate in Paris, and I know that he maintains himself and since entering the service has married, and I hope is in the process of raising a family on the salary of a consul.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. I yield.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Is it not a fact that it is a little easier for men stationed abroad to sustain themselves with the present depreciated currency of 17 francs to the dollar, for instance, so that conditions that exist right now are not a safe indication of ordinary, normal conditions?

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. I grant you that, but the point I am undertaking to make is that this bill on the whole does not materially help the Consular Service, because already in that service the salaries are very nearly as high, on an average, as they will be under this bill; in fact, in one or two instances this bill reduces the salaries of consuls general. We have in the service now two consuls general at a salary of \$12,000, and under this bill the maximum will be \$9,000. But that is not what I wanted to advert to.

I would not object to some increase in salaries in the foreign service, but I do object to that feature of the bill which provides the high rates of retirement which it undertakes to provide. Under this bill it would be possible for a secretary of embassy, not a minister, because this bill does not deal with ministers and does not deal with ambassadors, but a secretary of embassy, and all of you have secretaries—it would be possible for a secretary of embassy after 30 years of service to retire at an annual retirement compensation of \$5,400. That is too high, gentlemen. Just as surely as we adopt this kind of a provision for the State Department, we shall have every other branch of this Government coming to the doors of Congress and asking for an increase in their retirement pay, and they will find justification in doing so.

This bill provides, in addition, for a representation allowance, and I am opposed to representation allowances. I opposed representation allowances in the Foreign Affairs Committee all during the war. We never had such a thing prior to the war, and it was adopted during the war to supplement the compensation of certain missions in foreign countries where extraordinary conditions existed. I do not believe it is sound public policy, and I do not believe it comports with the best administration to turn over to the State Department a lump sum out of which it will dole allowances to the various missions for entertainment and for living purposes. I believe that whatever salaries our foreign representatives should receive should be fixed by law.

Another feature of this bill to which I object is the provision that after a man has been abroad three years, he is granted a statutory leave. I do not object to that, but the Secretary of State can authorize and direct him during his leave to return to the United States and all of the expenses of the trip coming and going are to be borne by the Federal Government.

I have no objection to the features of this bill, which make the two services interchangeable from one branch to the other. I think the Secretary of State, perhaps, could do that under the existing law, but I do contend that the whole purpose of this bill is not to benefit especially the Consular Service, but is to benefit the secretaries of embassies, and I deny that the

salaries as carried in this bill will be lower than those that obtain in the British service.

If you will turn to the hearings, on page 154 there appears a table which shows the relative salaries of positions in the British and American services.

Mr. Chairman, what I oppose and what I regret to observe is that gentlemen who have spoken on this bill so far seem to believe that the only function of our foreign service is to get trade and get commerce with the United States. That is a legitimate activity, but the trouble with our foreign service now is that it has got a dollar mark written all over it.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman permit an interruption?

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. A wrong inference might be drawn from what the gentleman has just said. The gentleman will remember that our diplomatic and consular officers are prohibited from themselves engaging in any private business in a country where they are located, and they are prohibited from investing their savings in securities of any foreign country so that they are confined to their salary absolutely.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. I will say to the gentleman from Wisconsin I did not mean to suggest they were engaged in private profit making, but what I meant was that all of our foreign policy seems to be motivated, if I may use that rather mouth-filling term, by the dollar mark. The only object of our foreign policy seems to be to set up some kind of agency in a foreign country to make selling agents of our consuls and our diplomatic officers.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. I do not want to be discourteous, but I have only two minutes and I regret I can not yield.

To make selling agents and salesmen of our diplomats and of our consular officers. I rather think that the United States in a more simple way, in the way of Benjamin Franklin, in the way of other distinguished representatives of this country abroad in the early days, is not dependent for its standing upon expensive diplomatic entertainment.

We do not need to provide salaries sufficient for every little secretary to hold parties and levees and to entertain abroad; but what we need is a foreign service that is not simply looking out for the dollar but trying to look out for the United States abroad as a country that believes in international good will, international peace, and in those higher international policies that will place America before the world as a great country of liberal ideas and of peace rather than a country that is going forth with a salesman's satchel with dollar marks all over it.

I hope the President of the United States will persevere in his so far rather tame and colorless advocacy of the world court. I hope the President of the United States will make good his proclamation that he proposes to follow up the doctrines of President Harding in that respect, and that instead of lamely and colorlessly, in a whisper, saying to the United States Senate, "You have got the world court before you, and you can do what you please with it," I hope the President of the United States will come forth with a clear and striking and insistent call upon the country and really carry on a campaign in behalf of the world court and by so doing say to all the world that America not only wants international trade, that we not only want the commerce of the world, but that the United States is willing to assume its own place, willing to take up its own obligations at the council table of the world in behalf of peace, in behalf of liberty, in behalf of fair dealing between all countries of the world, as well as going forth with a satchel covered all over by dollar marks. [Applause.] Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. TEMPLE] four minutes.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield my remaining time to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. TEMPLE].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for seven minutes.

Mr. TEMPLE. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, this bill is one of very great importance and I think deserves the support of every Member of the House who is interested in the proper conduct of the foreign affairs of this country. I have been astonished for many years, not merely to-day, but every time I have recalled the fact, that we are in the habit of appropriating from year to year over \$300,000,000 for the Army and within a measurable distance the same sum for the Navy—six or seven hundred million dollars annually to prepare against war and only \$8,000,000 to carry on the foreign affairs of the country in such a way as to prevent war by reaching an amicable agreement on matters which might become irritating if neglected or improperly handled.

This is a bill of four fundamental propositions. The first is for the adoption of salaries which will be uniform for the relative grades in the two services, the Diplomatic and Consular, and it combines the two services, so far as the legal standard is concerned, by creating the one foreign service. The amalgamation is such that an officer may be transferred from one service to the other, from the Consular Service to the Diplomatic Service, and from the Diplomatic Service to the Consular Service. The present salaries of the Consular Service, with the exception of two posts at \$12,000, run from \$2,000 to \$8,000. Under the proposed bill the salaries will be from \$3,000 to \$9,000, a material increase of salaries in the Consular Service.

In the Diplomatic Service the present salaries run from \$2,500 to \$4,000 for secretaries of embassies and legations. Under this bill they will range from \$3,000 to \$9,000, which, of course, is a considerable increase.

These salaries are not for clerks, as was stated by the gentleman from Mississippi. I hope the gentleman understands the difference between a clerk employed in an embassy and the secretary of an embassy. There is no reproach in the word "secretary." We employ it when speaking of Members of the Cabinet, Secretary of State, Secretary of the Treasury, Secretary of Commerce. The bill does not touch the salaries of clerks employed in embassies or legations. It deals with secretaries. Who are these secretaries? John Hay spent the most of his life as secretary in the Diplomatic Service and later became ambassador and Secretary of State. He was just as big a man and did just as good work when secretary of embassy as when he was Secretary of State in the President's Cabinet.

Mr. COLLINS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEMPLE. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. COLLINS. Do not these gentlemen perform strictly clerical duties?

Mr. TEMPLE. They are not clerks. The gentleman intended to give the Members of the House the idea that these men were simply clerks, but they are not. There is a class of men who are clerks. They, and not the secretaries, do the clerical work of the embassies. Their salaries are not changed by this bill, but secretaries of embassies are men who will be permitted, if they show their fitness, to be ministers and ambassadors in the future. The men whom the gentleman from Mississippi called clerks at \$9,000 a year are high officers of the foreign service. Under this bill the salary of \$9,000 is to be paid only to foreign service officers of class 1, which includes only secretaries designated as counselors of embassy, ranking next to the ambassador and acting in the ambassador's place during his absence, and including also consuls general of classes 1 and 2.

Many of these men are fitted to become ministers and ambassadors, are eligible for promotion to such places, and several of our representatives, ambassadors, and ministers, have been promoted after long service as secretaries. The secretaries are men of the right type, fitted for the Diplomatic Service, and a salary that runs up in the later years as high as \$9,000 is not too much for those men.

Also, the gentleman said something about the possibility of using the representation allowance to buy clothing. He said something about trousers at \$600 a pair. My information is that the standard price for the complete outfit in London, including all of the trappings that go with it, is £50, or about \$250.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEMPLE. In just a moment. The representation allowance would not be available for such use in any event. It is not an allowance made to each individual in the service. It is an allowance made to the embassy or legation, or to the consular office, and it is to be accounted for under the terms of this bill after it has been expended in accordance with the regulations to be made by the President of the United States. There is nothing loose about that plan. Every dollar of it will be accounted for, and the expenditures will be made according to rules fixed by the President of the United States.

The bill does not increase the total expenses of the State Department beyond half a million dollars, and as has been pointed out here, the income received for the services of the consular officers runs within half a million dollars of the total appropriation that we make. It is a bagatelle in comparison with the billions of dollars that we spend.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired. All time has expired. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, we ought to have a quorum here to read the bill and I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Eighty-five Members present, not

a quorum. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will bring in absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

Anderson	Fenn	Little	Scott
Anthony	Fish	Logan	Sears, Nebr.
Arnold	Foster	Lyon	Sears, Fla.
Aswell	Fredericks	McClintic	Seger
Bacharach	Freeman	McDuffie	Sherwood
Barkley	Funk	McLaughlin, Nebr.	Sites
Bell	Gallivan	MacGregor	Smithwick
Berger	Garber	Magee, Pa.	Snell
Bloom	Garrett, Tex.	Mansfield	Snyder
Bowling	Geran	Mead	Sproul, Ill.
Boyce	Gilbert	Michaelson	Stengle
Boylan	Goldsbrough	Miller, Ill.	Strong, Pa.
Briggs	Greene, Mass.	Milligan	Sullivan
Britten	Griffin	Montague	Sweet
Browne, N. J.	Hadley	Mooney	Tague
Burdick	Hammer	Moore, Ill.	Taylor, Colo.
Burton	Hawley	Morin	Taylor, Tenn.
Busby	Hayden	Mudd	Thatcher
Byrns, Tenn.	Hersey	Murphy	Tincher
Campbell	Hill, Md.	Nelson, Wis.	Tucker
Carew	Hoch	Newton, Minn.	Tydings
Casey	Hooker	O'Connell, N. Y.	Upshaw
Clark, Fla.	Howard, Okla.	O'Connor, N. Y.	Vare
Clarke, N. Y.	Hudspeth	O'Sullivan	Vestal
Cleary	Hull, Tenn.	Parker	Ward, N. Y.
Cole, Ohio	Hull, William E.	Patterson	Ward, N. C.
Connolly, Pa.	Humphreys	Peavey	Wason
Cullen	Jeffers	Peery	Watkins
Curry	Johnson, Wash.	Perkins	Watres
Davey	Johnson, W. Va.	Perlman	Watson
Deal	Kahn	Quayle	Weller
Dempsey	Kelly	Ralney	Welsh
Denison	Kendall	Ramsayer	Winslow
Dickstein	Kent	Ransley	Winter
Dominick	Kless	Reece	Wood
Doughton	Kindred	Reed, W. Va.	Woodruff
Doyle	King	Reid, Ill.	Woodrum
Drane	Knutson	Robinson	Warzbach
Dyer	Kurtz	Romgue	Yates
Edmonds	LaGuardia	Rosenbloom	Zahlman
Fairchild	Langley	Sabath	
Faust	Lindsay	Schall	
Favrot	Lineberger	Schneider	

The committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. TILSON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 6357, had found itself without a quorum, that he had directed the roll to be called, whereupon 263 Members answered to their names, a quorum, and he handed in the list of the absentees for printing in the Record and the Journal.

The committee resumed its session.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That hereafter the Diplomatic and Consular Service of the United States shall be known as the foreign service of the United States.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. It is not necessary for me to say a word for the bill, I think, to convince every man in the House of its merit. The bill proposes, first, the adoption of a new uniform salary scale, with a modest increase in the average rate of compensation, an amalgamation of the Diplomatic and Consular Service, and an interchange or transfer of men from one service to another, so that if a man in the Consular Service develops any peculiar or special ability for the Diplomatic Service, his knowledge and experience may be taken advantage of by the Government through his transfer to the Diplomatic Service. On the other hand, if a man should develop a peculiar and special knowledge in the Diplomatic Service which would be of great advantage to the Government in the Consular Service, a similar transfer may be made.

The purpose of the bill, as I understand it, is to use all of the knowledge and experience of a man in both of these services where the knowledge and experience can be best utilized to the advantage of the American people.

The compensation paid to the men in both the Diplomatic and Consular Service in the past has been totally inadequate. The men who have gone into both of these services are men of special training. No man can enter either service without passing the most rigid examination, except in the case of the appointment of an ambassador or a diplomat of high place. The peculiar educational qualifications required of men in the foreign service of the country justifies the Government in paying them a compensation which will enable them to live without borrowing money from rich relatives, and they have not been able to do that in the past.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. I have a very high regard for the gentleman's statesmanship, and especially do I admire his wonderful attitude respecting economy. I understand the gentleman is in favor of raising salaries generally?

Mr. MADDEN. I am favoring the raise of these salaries.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. But of no others?

Mr. MADDEN. Oh, yes; I have favored others. I want adequate compensation for proper service rendered.

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I do not think I ought to yield further. I want to express just one or two thoughts. The peculiar laws under which we have operated our Diplomatic and Consular Service in the past have prevented the Government from getting the best talent that could be obtained. They have kept out of the service men who would like to serve their country, who have no desire whatever to make money, but who have been specially trained for a class of work which the Government very much needs. Up to this time many of the best men who would like to do this service for the country have not been able to do it.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Not now. They have not been able to do it because they could not afford to do it. This bill encourages the hope that in the future we will be able to get the best men, because the compensation will meet the needs of the case.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. MADDEN. May I have two minutes more?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes more. Is there objection?

Mr. BLANTON. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have five minutes more. I want to ask him a question.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for five minutes more.

Mr. MADDEN. There is one other feature of the bill that I think is important, and that is the retirement feature of it. The men who are engaged in these services under this law, if it is enacted, will be required to pay substantially all that will be necessary to pay the retirement compensation. I believe that this is the most salutary feature of the law, because after men have given their whole life to the Government without any hope or opportunity of accumulating a competence to care for themselves in their old age, they should be entitled to a retirement compensation which will provide for them in their late days in life, and if they are willing themselves during the course of their service to make the contribution to the fund from which they are to be paid and these contributions are adequate to meet the payment, why, they are simply using the Government in such a case as the depository for the funds which they themselves have taken from their salaries.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman spoke of the salary raises as being "moderate." Does the gentleman know that there is one man whose salary is doubled in this bill?

Mr. MADDEN. Oh, yes.

Mr. BLANTON. I want to ask this further question. The greatest speech I ever heard the gentleman make in all his great speeches was made at 3 o'clock in the closing hours of the last Congress, when he took just the opposite view of these foreign matters that he now takes.

Mr. MADDEN. I was not talking then about salaries at all. I was then talking about an appropriation for an embassy, not about salaries, not about men, except incidentally.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have said substantially all I have to say. There has been no bill pending before this House during this session that has more merit than the pending bill, and I hope that every man in the House who believes that we ought to have an efficient foreign service will vote for the bill. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has again expired. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 3. That the officers in the foreign service shall hereafter be graded and classified as follows, with the salaries of each class herein affixed thereto, but not exceeding in number for each class a proportion to the total number of officers in the service represented in the following percentage limitations: Ambassadors and ministers as now or hereafter provided; foreign-service officers as follows: Class 1, 6 per cent, \$9,000; class 2, 7 per cent, \$8,000; class 3, 8 per cent, \$7,000; class 4, 9 per cent, \$6,000; class 5, 10 per cent, \$5,000; class 6, 14 per cent, \$4,500; class 7, \$4,000; class 8, \$3,500; class 9, \$3,000; unclassified, \$3,000 to \$1,500.

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts: Page 2, line 12, at the end of section 3, add the following: "Provided, That as many foreign-service officers above class 6 as may be required for the purpose of inspection be detailed by the Secretary of State for that purpose."

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of that amendment is in order to remedy an error that was made in transcribing the bill. The language of the amendment was carried in the bill that was passed at the last session by the House, and it was in the bill as introduced in this Congress. It was before the committee and was approved by the committee, but by an error when the present draft of the bill was introduced it was omitted. It simply provides for the detailing of a suitable number of inspectors of missions and consulates throughout the world.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

Amendment offered by Mr. COLLINS: Page 2, line 7, after the colon, strike out rest of section and insert in lieu thereof the following: "Class 1, 6 per cent, \$7,500; class 2, 7 per cent, \$6,500; class 3, 8 per cent, \$5,500; class 4, 9 per cent, \$5,000; class 5, 10 per cent, \$4,500; class 6, 14 per cent, \$4,000; class 7, \$3,500; class 8, \$3,250; class 9, \$3,000; unclassified, \$2,500 to \$1,500."

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Chairman, this amendment simply fixes the maximum salary of clerks and consuls. One Member prefers that clerks be called "secretaries." The maximum is fixed at \$7,500, the same salary that a Member of Congress receives or that a Member of the United States Senate receives. These young gentlemen working in the legations and embassies whom I have called clerks—many of them are stenographers or do purely clerical work. We call the persons that work for us and in the departments and perform duties of that kind "clerks"; and I do not feel that we are reflecting on them when we call them "clerks." The fact that those in the Diplomatic Service are in Europe does not make them better than those here.

Under my amendment the maximum salaries are fixed at \$7,500 a year. This amendment does not reduce the salary of any person in the foreign service. Very few are receiving more than that. As a matter of fact, there is no one in the Diplomatic Service that is receiving that now. The minimum there is now \$2,500. The maximum is \$4,000. My amendment gives the highest paid an increase of \$3,500, and that is a substantial increase.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLLINS. Yes.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. I would like to call my friend's attention also to the fact that in the Lehlbach classification bill the highest salary that can be paid to any civilian in any department of the Government is \$7,500, and that must be the head of a department.

Mr. COLLINS. I thank the gentleman for this information. These men are not the heads of departments; they perform purely clerical duties.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLLINS. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. That is true except as to 30 men. Except as to 30 men that statement is absolutely true.

Mr. COLLINS. As far as the consuls and consuls general are concerned their salaries are not decreased by my amendment, because there is an express provision in this bill that the salaries which are now in effect shall continue until some one

else is placed in their positions. On the other hand, if their salaries are lower than is provided herein, they are given the benefit of the higher salary. No man's salary is reduced and many salaries are raised.

Mr. BEEDY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLLINS. Yes.

Mr. BEEDY. The gentleman, in the course of his travels last summer, had occasion to visit some of the American consuls abroad, did he not?

Mr. COLLINS. Yes.

Mr. BEEDY. Does the gentleman want the Members of this House to understand it is his belief that the services which those consuls were rendering their country are the same as the services now being rendered in Washington by his clerk and mine?

Mr. COLLINS. If the gentleman had heard my first speech—

Mr. BEEDY. I am asking the gentleman a question and he can answer it yes or no.

Mr. COLLINS. I am going to answer his question, but I am going to answer it in my own way, not by yes or no. I said earlier in the day that if this bill had related simply to consuls and consuls general perhaps I would have supported that part of it relating to salaries. But this bill is not in the interest of the Consular Service. It is of benefit chiefly to employees in embassies and legations. My amendment does not reduce the salary of a single consul general or consul connected with the service; it will raise most of them, and raise them substantially. I have the very highest regard for those persons in the Consular Service. They are high-class officials and deserve just treatment by the Government. Neither have I anything against the young men in the Diplomatic Service. I do not feel, however, the salary increases to the latter class especially is wise or warranted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. This bill, gentlemen, limits all salaries to \$9,000. We now pay the consuls general in London and in Paris \$12,000, but we decrease the salaries of these officers to \$9,000 per year. The purpose of this bill is to begin at the foundation with the small-salaried men and raise their salaries.

We know we can not have efficient service without having the clerks and the secretaries skilled, experienced, and efficient. This bill does not raise the salary of any ambassador or any minister. The efficiency of an ambassador or of a minister depends quite largely upon the efficiency of the employees—the secretaries and subordinates under them—employees who have served an apprenticeship and have been in the foreign service many years and gained valuable experience. These men go out and procure the data, the facts upon which the ambassador or the minister forms his judgment and makes his decisions. If you do not have men of efficiency, capability, and experience as secretaries and as clerks you can not have efficient service and the ambassadors and ministers can not render sound judgments upon the facts which are brought before them.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLLINS] said the services of these people were simply clerical. I take it the gentleman does not agree with that statement?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. My distinguished friend from Mississippi, I think, is in error in his statement that the secretaries in the embassies and legations are simply secretaries in the way we think of secretaries to Congressmen or the secretaries we meet in the departments in Washington. These diplomatic secretaries before they become secretaries must have a great deal of experience; most of them are lawyers, and if the gentleman will look at the civil-service examinations that these secretaries are obliged to take he will see they must have a very thorough education, equivalent to a college education, and must be versed in at least one or two foreign languages; they must have a fair knowledge of international law and diplomatic usage; they must be very efficient men, men who could go out in the business field and command a good deal larger salary than they are getting in the foreign service.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. In just a second. If you meet the secretaries and clerks of our legations and embassies, you will find them men well equipped by education and natural ability for their positions. You will find they are men, as a rule, who could go right out of the service of the Government into private life and command a good deal larger salary than they are getting from the Government.

Consul General Skinner, of London, gets \$12,000 a year. He is the man whose reports are deemed so important that the business men all over the Nation are eager to get them. This man has been in the public service for 30 years; he has worked up from the smallest station, beginning with a salary of \$1,800 a year until he is now getting \$12,000 a year. There are only two consuls general who receive this salary. We want this whole foreign service on a basis that will attract young men, young men of ability and young men who can see a career ahead of them. It takes a splendid education to enter our foreign service, and as this service is to-day, without any retirement feature and with the small salaries, it offers no inducement to young men without an independent fortune; the result is that only men of wealth are entering our public service, which is absolutely undemocratic and un-American. By this bill we make it possible for young men of good education and ambition to enter the foreign service, with the possibility of promotion and with the satisfaction of knowing that when they reach 65 years of age they can be retired with a fair annuity.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin may proceed for one more minute.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin may proceed for one additional minute. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman knows that under this bill the consul general in London, of whom he spoke, will still get \$12,000?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. Then, he will not be reduced, will he?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. He will not be reduced during his term, but the salary of his office will be reduced.

Mr. BLANTON. His salary will continue at \$12,000 just as long as he occupies the position?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. Yes; as long as he occupies the position.

Mr. BLANTON. That was not stated awhile ago.

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. Six thousand dollars in the two salaries will go on for the length of time that these men of great experience hold the positions.

Mr. BLANTON. Then, the gentleman from Mississippi was correct in his statement?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. No; he was not correct in his statement, as I understood it. The gentleman's statement was that the Consular Service would remain the same, but under this bill they are all under the foreign service and we can exchange consuls and secretaries back and forth; they are interchangeable, which is one of the purposes of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has again expired.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

The committee rose informally, and the Speaker resumed the chair.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Welch, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed H. R. 6820, entitled "An act making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1925, and for other purposes," with amendments, in which the concurrence of the House was requested.

REORGANIZATION OF FOREIGN SERVICE

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. WINSLOW. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, it is not my purpose, for a lack of full information as to the details of this bill, to undertake to discuss the merits of every feature of it. It has happened, however, that ever since this Congress has been in session there has been a bill known as the Department of Commerce Foreign Bureau bill before the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, and it has fallen to my lot to follow that bill in its development and in its connection with the interests of the Department of Agriculture and the State Department. When we reviewed the work of the three departments each was rather working on its own account, after a tradition of many years, and no one in particular had come to realize the extent to which the work was necessarily dovetailed. We had many sessions and in one way and another and for one purpose and another until finally we came to some conclusions, and among the conclusions—and I am speaking now as an individual and not as the chairman of a committee—is that in respect of

the importance of keeping this foreign Diplomatic Service in good order.

As I tell you, I am not prepared to discuss the merits of any particular feature of this Rogers bill; but I have been led to believe that a reorganization, if we may call it such, of the State Department foreign service has become imperative; and in order to fit into the fine work which is being done by the Agricultural Department and by the Department of Commerce in foreign fields it has been found desirable to have a reorganization all along the line, and the purpose is to fit those departments together, in so far as they can be, and have all their work properly coordinated.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WINSLOW. I want to keep within the time, but beyond that I yield.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. How do the salaries fixed in this bill compare with the salaries fixed for the commercial attachés?

Mr. WINSLOW. Regretfully, I can not give you that information.

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman from Massachusetts permit me to answer that question?

Mr. WINSLOW. If I have the necessary time.

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The maximum salary provided in the Winslow bill for comparable offices is \$10,000, and the maximum salary in this bill, as has been brought out in the discussion, is \$9,000.

Mr. WINSLOW. As to the merits of these salaries, I regret I do not know enough about the subject to be intelligent in making remarks, and I am only speaking to the general purposes of the bill. Others who are defending the provisions of this proposed legislation will be able, I have no doubt, to give you accurate information.

It is highly important that we give encouragement to these three great departments that are representing the interests of the United States. They do dovetail. It is important they should work together, and under a proclamation recently promulgated by the President of the United States it will be a pretty difficult thing for the representatives in any of our foreign departments to go far afield from the line of work which is laid out for them to do, under the President's proclamation, which I presume has been explained to you. They will have to work together wherever they might come in conflict or wherever their work is in the same territory and in the same line. I desire only to speak for the bill as to its general purpose and intent and to emphasize the importance of working out some legislation along the lines of this bill, for the reason that I have knowledge of the fact that the three departments are in sympathy with the provision of this diplomatic rearrangement.

I am not so sure of my authority to speak for the Secretary of Agriculture, but I am perfectly willing to assure the gentlemen of the committee that, so far as the Department of Commerce is concerned and the Secretary of Commerce, they are heartily in favor of the bill and hope it will go through, not only for its own sake but in conjunction with the work of the other departments.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. BLANTON. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have one more minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BLANTON. If the gentleman will yield, the foreign service is a valuable asset to every business man in the United States, is it not?

Mr. WINSLOW. You mean all foreign service?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. WINSLOW. As we have it to-day, I think so, decidedly.

Mr. BLANTON. It is performing a service at the expense of the Government which the individual business man used to have to perform at his own expense, largely; is not that true?

Mr. WINSLOW. No; not quite that.

Mr. BLANTON. Partially?

Mr. WINSLOW. I think we have the same idea. It performs a service, twofold in its character, in respect of your inquiry. In the first place, it does what the business man hoped could be done but did not know how to do; and in the next place it has discovered new avenues of trade which the business man never knew existed. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BLANTON) there were—ayes 15, noes 49.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CONNALLY of Texas: Page 2, line 7, after the word "follows," strike out and insert: "Class 1, 6 per cent, \$8,000; class 2, 7 per cent, \$7,000; class 3, 8 per cent, \$6,500; class 4, 9 per cent, \$5,500; class 5, 10 per cent, \$4,500; class 6, 14 per cent, \$4,000; class 7, \$3,500; class 8, \$3,250; class 9, \$3,000; unclassified, \$3,000 to \$1,500."

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I do not want to make a speech on this proposed amendment. I simply want to say that this amendment slightly scales the salaries in the bill about \$500 a year in each class, beginning with a maximum of \$8,000 and leaving the minimum the same.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CONNALLY of Texas) there were 26 ayes and 49 noes.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, on page 2, line 8, I move to strike out "nine thousand" and insert in lieu thereof "eight thousand seven hundred and fifty."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 8, strike out "nine thousand" and insert in lieu thereof "eight thousand seven hundred and fifty."

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent that all debate on the section and amendments thereto close in five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, this is merely a pro forma amendment. There is no chance in the world to alter an item in this bill. I realize that. There have been two opportunities given this body to economize. Two opportunities have been given you to reduce the expenses in this bill, and you have turned them both down. They were not radical propositions; they were conservative business propositions that were offered. The amendment of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLLINS] and the amendment of my colleague from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] were both business propositions. You have turned them both down. I want the Record to show that there was not a single Republican in this body that voted for either proposition—not one. I want the blame placed right where it belongs.

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. Does the gentleman know that the sums fixed in this bill have been considered by a committee upon hearings?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; I know that. That was done last year; and therefore we are all bound to vote for everything in the bill, are we?

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. And no specific reason has been assigned for reducing them.

Mr. BLANTON. In the Republican Party nothing is any reason for reducing expenses. That is the policy of the Republican Party. As long as they can increase officeholders and raise their salaries you will never get Republicans to vote against it. They are always in favor of raising salaries, and that is the reason that this Government is now nearly a \$4,000,000,000 Government. We have had a war. Yes; but why do we not forget it. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] admitted here on the floor of this House the other day that we still have on the Government pay roll in the city of Washington 30,000 surplus employees, and he said they ought to be sent home. Why does he not cut them off? Because every time he cuts one of them off they run down to one of you Representatives or Senators and have you force the department to put them back.

They are on the pay roll because the gentleman from Illinois would not reduce the appropriation to pay for their salaries. If he would reduce the appropriations, and not provide salaries for them, we could send the 30,000 surplus employees out of town. They ought to be sent home. But you will not find Republicans voting to do that.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Did not the Republican Party reduce the Budget from six billion to three billion and a half?

Mr. BLANTON. That was an automatic reduction. [Laughter on the Republican side.] The reduction was the automatic result of peace. If there had been even a bolshevistic administration it would have been reduced just the same, as ridiculous as that might seem. Because with a bolshevistic administration God knows we could have a \$10,000,000,000 Government.

Mr. FITZGERALD. And doesn't the gentleman know that the Republican administration reduced the Federal employees by more than 107,000 during that administration?

Mr. BLANTON. I just told the gentleman that was an automatic reduction. [Laughter on the Republican side.] You can claim credit for it if you want to, but if you want to really deserve credit for making reductions you ought to make good what the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] said when he said there were 30,000 surplus employees on the pay roll and send them home. If you will send them home and take them off the pay roll, I will take my hat off to you and send each of you a bouquet. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BLANTON. That was a pro forma amendment which I am willing to withdraw.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 4. That foreign service officers may be appointed as secretaries in the Diplomatic Service or as consular officers, or both: *Provided*, That all such appointments shall be made by and with the advice and consent of the Senate: *Provided further*, That all official acts of such officers while on duty in either the diplomatic or consular branch of the foreign service shall be performed under their respective commissions as secretaries or as consular officers.

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I hope I am in time to file a lis pendens against my distinguished friend from North Carolina [Mr. ABERNETHY]. On yesterday he made a speech in which he claimed everything for North Carolina except Andrew Jackson, and I was here watching him or he would have claimed him. But the part of his speech that I want to lodge a caveat against is this:

And on April 25, 1776, North Carolina, first of all the Colonies, empowered her delegates to the Continental Congress to vote for independence.

The Battles of Kings Mountain and Guilford Courthouse are written in emblazoned glory upon the pages of history. The part played by North Carolina in the Revolution was second to none of the original thirteen Colonies.

I rise to serve notice that Kings Mountain has been in my district and has been in South Carolina ever since the battle was fought, unless it has been moved recently. Furthermore, this Congress established Kings Mountain as being in South Carolina by putting a monument there. I do not believe the gentleman from North Carolina will be able to carry it across the line, and I serve notice on him that he is going to have a lawsuit if he tries it.

Mr. LOWREY. The gentleman from North Carolina claimed oysters for North Carolina. I do not think the gentleman will deny that he has met some of them.

Mr. STEVENSON. Oh, yes; I have; but the gentleman to whom I refer is not one of them, because he can talk all right.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 7. That on the date on which this act becomes effective the Secretary of State shall certify to the President, with his recommendation in each case, the record of efficiency of the several secretaries in the Diplomatic Service, consuls general, consuls, vice consuls of career, consular assistants, interpreters, and student interpreters then in office and shall, except in cases of persons found to merit reduction in rank or dismissal from the service, recommend to the President the re-commissioning, without further examination, of those then in office as follows:

Secretaries of class 1 designated as counselors of legation, and consuls general of classes 1 and 2 as foreign service officers of class 1.

Secretaries of class 1 designated as counselors of legations and consuls of class 3 as foreign service officers of class 2.

Secretaries of class 1 not designated as counselors, consuls general of class 4, and consuls general at large as foreign service officers of class 3.

Secretaries of class 2, consuls general of class 5, consuls of classes 1, 2, and 3, and Chinese, Japanese, and Turkish secretaries as foreign service officers of class 4.

Consuls of class 4 as foreign service officers of class 5.

Secretaries of class 3, consuls of class 5, and Chinese, Japanese, and Turkish assistant secretaries as foreign service officers of class 6.

Consuls of class 6 as foreign service officers of class 7.

Secretaries of class 4 and consuls of class 7 as foreign service officers of class 8.

Consuls of classes 8 and 9 as foreign service officers of class 9.

Vice consuls of career, consular assistants, interpreters, and student interpreters as foreign service officers, unclassified.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. BLANTON: Page 4, line 12, strike out the words "and student interpreters."

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, for a number of years we have been carrying appropriations every year to pay salaries and subsistence, board and lodging, and schooling for a lot of student interpreters in Turkey, China, and Japan, and possibly some other places. I am informed that they are mostly patronage jobs. They are for friends of some of our friends in a great many instances. You have a young man who is a bright young fellow and you want to help educate him, and you send him over there to enter school as a student interpreter and have the Government pay him a salary, pay for his lodging and his subsistence and his schooling, and when he becomes educated so that he can speak the language fluently, instead of him giving his service to Uncle Sam, in many instances he sells what the Government has given him to some private commercial enterprise. That has been done in a number of cases that have been called to my attention in the last 10 years.

Mr. TEMPLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. TEMPLE. Does not the gentleman know that the reason that he sells his services to some corporation is because the corporation outbids the Government and pays the higher salary?

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, of course it does. The Government will never be able to compete with outside business on salaries. We may just as well quit trying to do anything of that kind. We take a young fellow who does not know A from izzard and we send him over there and educate him. Of course, we have made him a valuable man. We teach him to speak fluently the Chinese language or the Japanese language, or the various other substitutes that are used for the main language, and he becomes a valuable man, and commerce wants him and commerce takes him, and all the public money that we have spent upon him is lost.

Mr. TEMPLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, by yielding continually I am not going to put myself up here as a target for committee men and their friends who travel to shoot at. You know all of our committees, mostly, are traveling committees, to a more or less extent, and the Foreign Affairs Committee is the main traveling committee of the House. It travels abroad. All of its members have been abroad, have they not?

Mr. TEMPLE. Not at Government expense.

Mr. BLANTON. I did not say that. I say that they have been abroad.

Mr. TEMPLE. I wanted the RECORD to show that what might be concluded from the gentleman's remarks is a mistake.

Mr. BLANTON. Some of them have been abroad at Government expense.

Mr. TEMPLE. Not as members of the committee.

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, the chairman and various others have.

Mr. TEMPLE. Not as members of the committee.

Mr. BLANTON. But we sent the chairman of this committee over there twice last year.

Mr. TEMPLE. Not as a member of the committee.

Mr. BLANTON. But we sent him over there, nevertheless, and paid his expenses twice, and we are going to send him twice this year, for you have already passed a measure allowing \$40,000. It doesn't make any difference whether he went as a member of the committee or of a commission. He went just the same and is going again this year.

Mr. TEMPLE. If he will do as much good this year as he did last year, we ought to send him more than twice.

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, I am not complaining. He likely performs valuable service. I did try to reduce his appropriation from \$40,000 to \$10,000, as I thought \$40,000 was too much for five people to spend. I mentioned about these trips abroad,

because members of the committee come in contact with these foreign officers, and the foreign officers are nice to them and entertain them royally over there, and they appeal to them, and then these gentlemen come back and immediately want to raise their salaries.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Chairman, I make the same request.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. By way of variety and only for a moment I desire to give the committee the facts about these student interpreters. There are but three student interpreters at the moment. All of them are in Peking. Each of the three receives a salary of \$1,500 a year, and no more. They are under contract to stay on in the employment of the Government for at least five years, at the end of which time they are free to resign, as they ought to be. After they have been trained for a period of three years they will, if found competent, rise to be interpreters. After a time as interpreters, they will be promoted to be Chinese secretaries. These officials, in my judgment, are as important as any that the United States has anywhere in the field to-day. There is no patronage whatever in the appointments. They are selected on merit after examination. It is not easy to find competent Americans who know the Chinese language or who will learn it. I know of no way to get the men that the Government must have in the Orient for its purposes as good as the way proposed here.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. ABERNETHY rose.

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate upon this section and all amendments thereto close in five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent that all debate upon this section and all amendments thereto close in five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, a very serious diplomatic controversy has arisen during my absence from the Chamber. I was charged with removing a mountain yesterday by the name of Kings Mountain, and I desire to lodge my objection to what has been said by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. STEVENSON]. We could readily have claimed the birthplace of Andrew Jackson, but we did not do it, and I never said anything in my speech at all yesterday about Kings Mountain being in North Carolina. Half of the mountain is in South Carolina, but North Carolina furnished the larger portion of the troops that carried on the battle, and that is all that I referred to. The gentleman was born in North Carolina, and he is only temporarily living in South Carolina, being loaned to that State, and he should not go back on the place of his birth and try to take away the credit due to my State.

Mr. LOWREY. Does the gentleman think it is right for the State of North Carolina to claim two such distinguished gentlemen as the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. STEVENSON] and the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. ABERNETHY]? [Laughter.]

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Does not the gentleman think that if the gentleman from North Carolina and the gentleman from South Carolina were to revive that historic transaction which took place between the governors of those States respectively, they could settle upon the facts? [Laughter.]

Mr. ABERNETHY. Since the Volstead Act was passed that has been made impracticable. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The pro forma amendment is withdrawn. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 8. That consuls general of class 1 and consuls of class 1 holding office at the time this act takes effect shall not, as a result of their recommissioning or reclassification, suffer a reduction in salary below that which they are then receiving: *Provided, however*, That this provision shall apply only to the incumbents of the offices mentioned at the time this act becomes effective.

That the grade of consular assistant is hereby abolished, and that all consular assistants now in the service shall be recommissioned as foreign service officers, unclassified.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out all of the first paragraph of section 8, beginning with line 19 to line 25, inclusive.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BLANTON: Page 5, line 19, strike out all of lines 19 to 25, inclusive.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, the report on this bill now under discussion indicated that there would be some salaries reduced, but this paragraph prevents any of the present incumbents from having their salaries reduced, and these consuls general will continue to draw the \$12,000 just as long as they live and hold that office.

Mr. MOORES of Indiana. And one of them is 79 years of age.

Mr. BLANTON. Well, I know of a man who is 101 years old. Of course, we not all live that long.

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. There are only two consuls general of class 1.

Mr. BLANTON. Does the gentleman say that only two consuls general are affected by this paragraph?

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Yes; and one of them soon retires automatically. We thought it was not fair to take away the best consul general that we have, Consul General Skinner at London. There is a limitation in the law that no retirement basic pay shall be higher than \$9,000. The gentleman will find that is provided for on line 12.

Mr. BLANTON. Then that is not controlled by the language of that article?

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. It is not.

Mr. BLANTON. Well, if it only embraces those two men I will not insist upon it. I will ask leave to withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will be withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 12. That the President is hereby authorized to grant to diplomatic missions and to consular offices at capitals of countries where there is no diplomatic mission of the United States representation allowances out of any money which may be appropriated for such purpose from time to time by Congress, the expenditure of such representation allowance to be accounted for in detail to the Department of State quarterly under such rules and regulations as the President may prescribe.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COLLINS: Page 7, strike out all of section 12.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Chairman, this is an entirely new section. As I understand, it is contained in this bill for the first time.

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman permit an interruption?

Mr. COLLINS. Yes.

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. It was carried in this bill at the last session in identically the same language.

Mr. COLLINS. This bill has been before this committee since May, 1919, and I understood that this section was now carried for the first time. I stand corrected, however, on this. This section authorizes the grant to diplomatic missions or to consular officers at capitals of countries where there is no diplomatic mission of the United States representation allowance out of any money appropriated, and so forth.

Now, as I pointed out, representation allowance is a very much larger allowance than a post allowance. Post allowances have been granted in the past few years, and I think are carried in appropriation bills now to the extent of \$150,000 per annum. Post allowance covers merely the difference in exchange rates and is allowed only to the lower-paid employees, according to the testimony of the witnesses who appeared before this committee.

Representation allowance covers everything; it covers any sort of expense that a mission goes to as the result of representing this Government abroad. An automobile can be purchased by an ambassador under this section. Entertainments

can be paid for out of this fund. Almost anything you can conceive of can be paid for under a representation allowance. Now, the amount that is going to be involved annually as a result of this provision in this bill is something that none of us can estimate.

It will be up to the whims and caprices of the people who represent this Government abroad; and, contrary to what might be supposed, the language in this section does not give the representation allowance solely to the minister or ambassador but gives it to the mission, and the mission includes not only the minister or ambassador but likewise everyone who is in the employ of that particular mission abroad.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. COLLINS. I will.

Mr. BLANTON. Suppose they got the distinguished chairman of the committee over there some summer and entertained him well and got him to feeling good; then when he came back they put \$200,000 or \$300,000 in one of these bills for the representation allowance—how are we going to cut it out? We would be steam rolled and crushed on the floor.

Mr. MADDEN. They would not entertain me.

Mr. COLLINS. Post allowance, which represents merely the difference in exchange, amounted at one time during the war to \$700,000 a year. If difference in exchange alone should amount to \$700,000 a year, you can conceive by that what a representation allowance is going to be and what appropriation will be necessary in order to carry into effect the terms of section 12. I hazard the guess it will amount to \$1,000,000 annually within five years.

Now, so that no one will misunderstand what a representation allowance is, I am going to read what Mr. Carr, of the State Department, says:

A representation allowance is an allowance which has its origin in the practice of foreign governments. It may cover furniture and furnishings for the official residence and the rent of the officer's residence. It may cover entertainment. It may cover an allowance for receptions on the annual Fourth of July celebration. It may cover an allowance for expenses of official entertainment given to the officers and commanders of our fleets when they visit foreign ports.

It seems to me we ought not to be any more liberal with these gentlemen than they want us to be, and it seems to me we ought not to go out of our way to grant them a representation allowance when, according to their own testimony, they do not want additional pay. Mr. Gibson, on page 18, says:

I don't believe chiefs of missions do need more pay.

Well, a representation allowance is nothing but an increase in the pay. It is an indirect way of increasing the pay of this class of officers. We are certainly liberal enough without adding this additional pay increase.

This Government should not embark upon a program of paying for entertainment allowances for any class of public officers. There is no more reason—not so much—for entertainment allowance for officers abroad than those higher ones on this side, and certainly we do not favor entertainment allowance for even Cabinet officers, and why should we grant such to our clerical forces abroad?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I should like to request, if there is no further demand for time, that in five minutes all debate on this section and all amendments thereto be closed.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in five minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. BLANTON. This is an important section and I want five minutes on this section. This is one of the most important sections in the bill.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. And I should like to have five minutes.

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I have no desire to cut off debate.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman from Massachusetts make it 15 minutes?

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Then make it 17 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 17 minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. TEMPLE. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Mississippi, who just took his seat, quoted one sentence, and only one, from the statement of Mr. Gibson before the committee:

I don't believe chiefs of missions do need more pay.

But quoting so much and stopping there is very misleading. I should like to quote the rest of that paragraph. Mr. Gibson said:

I don't believe chiefs of missions do need more pay. This is a very old story, and year after year our friends have agitated to have us better paid! There have been a large number of friendly and appreciative newspaper articles written and a sincere effort on the part of many of our friends to get our pay increased. I honestly feel, however, that we can get on perfectly well with the pay we now have, subject to one condition. That condition is that our pay shall be considered in the same light as the pay granted to a man in private life, to a banker, or to a hod carrier; i. e., that it shall be considered as remuneration for services rendered and not as a contribution toward paying the expenses of doing Government business.

The representation allowance which it is proposed to give is to take the place of that contribution toward paying the expenses of doing Government business, which contribution every one of these men now makes in holding official receptions and in other ways. Mr. Gibson very justly characterizes that as a contribution out of the pocket of the ambassador or minister to the Government for the purpose of doing the Government's business, because such entertainment is absolutely necessary in the kind of service that the minister or ambassador is performing.

Now, Mr. Gibson continues:

The pay now given to a chief of mission is not his own, and to all intents and purposes, instead of being paid, a diplomatic official pays for the privilege of representing his country. I, for instance, am paid the very respectable sum of \$10,000 a year as minister in Warsaw. If this were my own money, to be spent on my own affairs, and part of it to be set aside to provide for my future, I should consider myself suitably paid. Instead of this, I spend all this money in order to represent the United States Government in a decent and dignified way.

I think the gentleman's remarks need no further answer.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I have no desire to be insistent about my objection to this section, but I do want the House to know what it is doing when it adopts this provision in the bill.

Now, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. TEMPLE], of course, is an enthusiast about the foreign service, and he is an enthusiast about our representatives living abroad in a dignified and decent way, as some of them term it. But he did not go far enough. If the gentleman from Mississippi did not quote all that Mr. Gibson said, neither did the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. TEMPLE. There are several pages of it.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. The gentleman from Pennsylvania did not quote something that is material. After saying that as minister to Poland he received \$10,000 a year and spent it all in living, what else did he say?

If I had twice as much income as I now have available, it could all be used advantageously for the same purpose, and with increased results for the people who have to look to me for support and protection.

Now, gentlemen, when it comes to matters of entertaining and when it comes to the matter of living in a dignified way abroad there is no limit. You could spend \$100,000 a year.

Mr. TEMPLE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Yes.

Mr. TEMPLE. The limit will be the sum appropriated each year by the Congress.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. I understand that, of course, but what I mean is that the Government can not undertake to do these things adequately or at all, according to my view. We could spend \$100,000 a year at every foreign post and then you would not entertain everybody who thought they ought to be entertained. It is not wise for this Government to adopt the policy of giving to diplomatic missions abroad Government funds out of which they may pay the expense of entertaining and various other expenses connected with foreign representation. If you adopt this provision and it becomes law, I want to warn you now that you will regret it, because you are turning over to the absolute whim of the State Department untold millions in the years that are to come.

I want to ask gentlemen on that side; I want to ask the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, who was pulled from his committee room here by influences to exert his great power in behalf of this bill; I want to ask the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, does he favor granting entertainment allowances to members of the Cabinet in this country? Does he believe the Secretary of the Navy ought to have a

fund provided out of the Public Treasury for entertainment purposes? He will not say he is in favor of that. Does he believe that the Secretary of War ought to have a fund—a representation allowance—for entertainment purposes? He will not say he is in favor of that.

Gentlemen, the best conception of public service is builded upon the theory that we can not receive the emoluments of people out in industry and in trade. What Congressman who sits on this floor could not spend twice his salary and spend it decently, if he undertook to live in Washington in a way that a great many foreign representatives live and in the way that successful business men in this city live? We can not do it.

It is one of the disadvantages under which we must suffer when we undertake public service.

If the time ever comes when the prestige of America abroad must be dependent upon the number of teas which its diplomats give to foreign people; if the influence of America abroad ever falls to that low level, when its barometer will register according to the number of receptions and levees which its representatives abroad give; whenever that time comes it will evidence the fact that the fiber of America and the things for which we are supposed to stand shall have perished.

I do not believe in it. I believe we ought to pay our foreign representatives a decent wage and a decent salary and let their influence spring from the fact that they represent a great country like our own, and not let their influence depend upon the amount of entertaining which they are able to do.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. I ask for two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The time has been limited. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Never mind, Mr. Chairman. The House is not sympathetic, and I do not care to speak further.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas withdraws his request.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, a man has to talk sometimes when the House is not sympathetic. I believe deep down in the heart of every man here who is not a member of this committee that he is against this paragraph. I believe the Members are against allowing large entertainment funds for our foreign officers, and if our distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations [Mr. MADDEN] was not chairman of that committee, knowing him as well as I have known him here in the last seven years, I know that he would be the first man to take this floor against this provision. He is only permitting this to go through now for two reasons: First, he is intimidated [laughter and applause] by his party; and, secondly, he believes that, as chairman of the committee, he is going to be able to control it.

Mr. LEHLBACH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I ask the gentleman to excuse me. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] thinks he will control it, and I want to say this for him, because I do not believe in waiting until a man dies and then putting flowers on his grave. He does believe in economy just as far as it is within the power of a Republican to believe in it. [Laughter and applause.] He works all the time for economy according to his lights. He tries hard to effect it, but he can not do it. And he is a valuable man to the country.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. I want to call the gentleman's attention to the Republican platform, which says that they all believe in it.

Mr. BLANTON. That is just a mouth declaration.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. The platform states that they believe in a policy of rigid economy.

Mr. BLANTON. That is for the public. I now yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. LEHLBACH. Seeing that the gentleman yielded to the gentleman from Texas, I would like to ask the gentleman whether the chairman of the Appropriations Committee has authorized him to speak for him.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman from Illinois is one of the genial, courteous men of the House; he will let any friend speak for him [laughter]; but I want to say this: He soon may get tired of this job. There is going to be something much better probably for him in the future than this job. We are not going to have him in there always to watch our finances, and there may be somebody in there at the head of that committee who will not think on these questions as the gentleman

from Illinois now thinks, and that may cost this Government hundreds of thousands of dollars annually in this one little item alone.

Why can we not vote this out? Are we hobbled by this committee? It is not the proper kind of legislation to pass. It is against the ideals and the policies of this Government, and the distinguished gentleman [Mr. MADDEN] forcefully and eloquently told us about it here, as I mentioned, at 3 o'clock in the morning during the closing hours of the last Congress. Why does he not tell us so now? What have they done to him to make him come in here and speak for a bill like that?

We have no chance to stop it. The committee is going to pass the bill. I am wasting time; I know that [laughter]; but somebody has got to protest. Let me call your attention to this fact: There was just a little handful of us when we began talking against the annual \$360,000 garden-seed proposition, and everybody laughed at us. They said we were wasting time. They said we could not stop it. We could only get 10 votes the first time we put it to a vote—just 10 votes against it—but we finally hammered on that proposition each and every year, and we got more and more votes against it each succeeding year until the House voted it out of the bill. That encourages me to fight and protest against these matters, even though some of you think we are not getting anywhere.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Does not the gentleman know that there were more Members on this side opposed to the garden-seed proposition than on that side?

Mr. BLANTON. Possibly so during this and last year, but the first time we put it to a vote there were only 10 votes against it.

I have the record of the fight for every year since I have been here when a vote was taken, and in the first fight we made there were only 10 votes against it.

Mr. LEHLBACH. That was on a motion to recommit made by the gentleman from Texas, and, of course, there were only 10 votes.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman from New Jersey, I presume, does not look at the measure before him but looks at and is controlled by the author of the measure. I look always at the measure. I do not care who proposes it. I would not care if the gentleman from New Jersey were sponsor for it, if it were a good measure I would support it. [Laughter and applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KETCHAM] is recognized for two minutes.

Mr. KETCHAM. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am sure we have been delighted by the usual entertainment furnished by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] in his discussions on the bill. As I listened, however, an old saying came to my mind, "What you are speaks so loud that I can not hear what you say." [Laughter.]

In that connection I want to bring to the committee in the moment given me a curious coincidence. Objection was raised by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY], I think on yesterday, concerning the extension privilege given the gentleman from Texas. The gentleman from Massachusetts made the statement that the expense of printing the extension granted the gentleman from Texas of 27 pages of advertising material gleaned from current newspapers was \$1,042. If the 435 Members of the House of Representatives had likewise on that day all availed themselves of the same privilege, the total cost of their extensions would have been over \$453,000, and that is within a few dollars of the exact net cost of our foreign establishment, both consular and diplomatic, for last year. [Laughter.]

More than that, if all the Members of the House had availed themselves of the same privilege of extension, the total number of pages on that day in the Record would have amounted to over 11,000, which is 4,000 more than the total number of pages filled by Members of both Houses of Congress thus far this session.

So I may say to the gentleman from Texas that when he speaks of economies it is well to practice as well as to preach. [Laughter and applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired, all time has expired, and the question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BLANTON) there were 19 ayes and 46 noes.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 13. Appropriations are authorized for the salary of a private secretary to each ambassador, who shall be appointed by the ambassador and hold office at his pleasure.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, on page 7, line 23, I move to strike out the words "appropriations are authorized."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BLANTON: Page 7, line 23, strike out the words "appropriations are authorized."

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KETCHAM] spoke of my having put some matter in the Record day before yesterday, and he says it cost the Government money. We have approximately 4,000 employees in the Government Printing Office who work on a regular salary. Now, get this in your minds. What goes into the Record at night does not cost the Government one cent more, whether it is put in by the gentleman from Texas or the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MORTON D. HULL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. MORTON D. HULL. Perhaps we can get rid of some of them.

Mr. BLANTON. I have been trying to get rid of the surplus employees ever since I have been here. If they had not been printing matter furnished by me, they would have been printing matter uttered by the gentleman from Michigan, which would have been of less importance. [Laughter.] I want to show you the importance of this matter. I want to show you that I saved the country and the people \$500,000.

Unfortunately, Mr. Chairman, neither our friend from Michigan [Mr. KETCHAM] nor our friend from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY] are lawyers. They know nothing about law. They know nothing about "construction of statutes." Neither of them know anything whatever about the importance of placing in the record of a congressional debate of a measure that is unconstitutional, all facts demonstrating its unconstitutionality.

They did not know that, when passing upon the question of whether or not a law is unconstitutional, the Supreme Court looks not only to the Constitution but also to the debate of Congress at the time it passed such law. So we must make allowance for their ignorance. We must consider the source from which the criticism comes. We must feel sorry for them, because they are not qualified to discern what is clearly apparent to every posted lawyer.

Now, what was the importance of those 15 pages of advertisements from the Washington Star which I placed in the Record? To our two criticizing friends they appeared merely as ordinary advertisements that had no significance whatever. But Congress was passing a measure which recited a "legislative declaration" that a "war emergency" still existed as a basis for extending a war bureau known as the Rent Commission, which has kept rental property occupied by tenants in the District of Columbia away from lawful owners for over five years and which, by such extension, was attempting to keep such property from lawful owners for an additional two years, until May 22, 1926.

The House of Representatives passed this bill last Monday, April 28, 1924, declaring that a war emergency still existed and would continue to exist until May 22, 1926, right in the face of a decision rendered by the Supreme Court on the preceding Monday, April 21, 1924, wherein the Supreme Court said that from judicial knowledge they would hold that no such war emergency existed now. And on last Monday there were three new cases pending before the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia involving the constitutionality of this Rent Commission, which cases will eventually reach the Supreme Court of the United States. And when passing upon such cases, and upon the new extension act which the House passed last Monday, the main question that will be before the court will be whether there is such a scarcity of rooms, apartments, and houses here in Washington as to constitute the emergency declared by Congress to exist. And the Supreme Court will look to the entire debate in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, at the time the bill was passed, to determine whether such emergency in fact existed. Every posted lawyer knows this. So, knowing this, I placed in said debate on such bill in said Record 15 pages from one newspaper alone, of date April 27, 1924, of advertisements offering property scattered all over this city for rent, and in instances some owners offered a bonus of one month's rent free to any tenant who would rent the property. And in such connection I offered excerpts from the printed hearings of the committee, from sworn testimony of the witnesses, showing not only that vacant properties existed all over the city offered for rent at fair prices but also that this war institution, the Rent Commission, was being used by avaricious landlords as an excuse for raising rents and for keeping vacant hundreds of unoccupied residences

which the owners would not rent because they did not want same controlled by undesirable tenants who they could not ever put out as long as the Rent Commission existed. This evidence showed that rents in the District of Columbia were higher because of the Rent Commission than they would be if we did not have it. And poor tenants all over the city were suffering thereby. And the Government was paying the bill for keeping up this war bureau, when by getting rid of this Rent Commission would save the Government, and the people, and the tenants several hundred thousand dollars each year.

And I knew that the only way to get rid of this Rent Commission and of this new extension act passed last Monday by the House was for the Supreme Court to knock it out as being unconstitutional. And, up to the time that I put that evidence in the Record, there was not any evidence of the existing conditions here in the District embraced in the entire debate, and I realized that it was necessary for such evidence to be incorporated in such debate, and therefore I had same printed in the Record, knowing that it would be instrumental in saving the Government, the municipality, and the good people here who are tenants several hundred thousand dollars each year.

In extending such remarks, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY] last night intimated that I did not get permission to do so. He is mistaken, just as he is about all of his criticism. If you will turn to page 7568 of the Record for last Monday, April 28, 1924, at the bottom of column 2, you will see the following:

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

During the debate last Monday, I was in control of one-half of the opposition time against that bill, and if I hadn't been using the time, it would have been used by somebody else, probably by the two criticizing gentlemen, Mr. KETCHAM and Mr. TREADWAY, and what they would have said would have gone into the Record, and would have occupied space according to what they said.

In what the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY] said yesterday, and what the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KETCHAM] has just said to-day, they would have the uninformed to believe that when there is not much to print in the Record of any day, there are some Government employees in the Printing Office who would make nothing that day, and would go hungry. That is not the case. Our force of approximately 4,000 employees in the Government Printing Office are regular employees, who work regularly, who are paid salaries, and get their pay checks every two weeks just like other Government employees, and who get their vacation leave, and their sick leave, and who are retired on retirement pay when they reach certain ages, and some of whom print the Record every night, whether it is much or little.

In said debate I was not making a record for the lower court, as I knew what the House would do, but I was preparing the record for the Supreme Court of the United States, which, on such record, will hold that rent act unconstitutional and void, and save \$500,000 annually.

Mr. MacLAFFERTY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. MacLAFFERTY. How does the gentleman get definite information on the coming decisions of the Supreme Court?

Mr. BLANTON. Because of what they held on the 21st day of April, 1924, when they then decided the rent act was unconstitutional, and they will hold it so again. The money that was spent in printing which the gentleman from Massachusetts talks about, despite what the gentleman from Massachusetts said about it in his speech, was well spent. I know how easy it is to get up and try to hamstring a man when he was against that kind of Rent Commission legislation. He [Mr. TREADWAY] must want the Supreme Court to hold it in order. They must believe in that kind of Rent Commission legislation up in Massachusetts, taking a man's property away from him without compensation for eight years after the war. His constituents must believe in it, and he is therefore getting up here and trying to hamstring me to please his Massachusetts constituents.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I think the committee would like to finish this bill to-night. I think we can do it to-night if we hasten debate as much as we can. I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section close in five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I do not want to interfere with the gentleman, but is the gentleman going to speak on the bill?

Mr. TREADWAY. This is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. If the chairman of the committee is going to hold us here late to-night and fill up the intervening time with debate upon matters not connected with the bill, I am going to start something.

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Inasmuch as the gentleman from Massachusetts, my colleague [Mr. TREADWAY], has been engaged in this colloquy, I thought it was only fair that he should be given opportunity to reply.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. I have no objection to that.

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I shall ask the members of the committee hereafter to confine themselves to the subject matter of the bill.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. When does the gentleman propose to have the committee rise?

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I think we can complete the bill this evening, in half an hour.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Does the gentleman intend to move to rise about 5 o'clock?

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I should like to complete the bill in committee to-night.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. I know; but I do not propose to stay here listening to debate on matters outside of the bill.

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. It is not possible to make a prediction with any accuracy.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. We have had the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KETCHAM] debate this matter, and then the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON], and we will now have the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY] and then probably somebody else.

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, I shall want to answer the gentleman.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Of course, the gentleman from Texas would want to answer.

Mr. TREADWAY. I shall yield part of my five minutes for his answer.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. I do not care how much these gentlemen talk, but I am not going to stay here late to-night to listen to them.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] stated that if the matter that he put into the Record—advertisements from the Washington Star—had not been inserted the pay of the employees of the Government Printing Office would have gone on just the same. I am reliably informed that the greater part of the work on the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is piecemeal, and that the men are paid by the amount of type set. I called up the Public Printer yesterday and was told that, per page, the amount was \$38.60. Therefore, the extension that the gentleman made, which he put in the Record of yesterday, did cost, as the gentleman from Michigan said, \$1,042. Nothing would have taken its place, so far as payment is concerned, if it had not been inserted, and it was therefore an additional expense.

The gentleman laid stress upon the fact that his insertion is of great value to the Supreme Court of the United States. Whoever heard of the Supreme Court accepting as evidence hearsay matter copied from the advertising pages of the newspapers, printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD? I am not a lawyer, but I defy anyone to say that that is legitimate and good evidence before the highest tribunal in the land. I think the gentleman was not furnishing anything to the Supreme Court when he caused the taxpayers to be charged with a thousand dollars or more for the insertion of extraneous matter, more than half of which he published in the Record without permission of this House.

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, I deny that, and as a matter of fact it would save \$500,000.

Mr. TREADWAY. It will save nothing, and the Supreme Court does not care a rap what the gentleman puts into the Record.

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, the gentleman says that because he is a layman and not a lawyer, and does not know.

Mr. TREADWAY. But I have a little common sense, and certainly the Supreme Court uses the same sort of common sense in combination with their great legal learning. Matter

printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is not of the slightest interest to the Supreme Court, nor is it legitimate evidence. The gentleman could not submit it to a court in his own district in Texas and get away with it. Why, it would not be evidence even before one of these investigating committees of the United States Senate, and the Lord knows they accept almost anything as evidence.

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, the gentleman is like an ostrich with his head in the sand.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 18. The President is authorized to prescribe rules and regulations for the establishment of a foreign service retirement and disability system to be administered under the direction of the Secretary of State and in accordance with the following principles, to wit:

(a) The Secretary of State shall submit annually a comparative report showing all receipts and disbursements on account of refunds, allowances, and annuities, together with the total number of persons receiving annuities and the amounts paid them, and shall submit annually estimates of appropriations necessary to continue this section in full force: *Provided*, That in no event shall the aggregate total appropriations exceed the aggregate total of the contributions of the foreign service officers theretofore made, and accumulated interest thereon.

(b) There is hereby created a special fund to be known as the foreign service retirement and disability fund.

(c) Five per cent of the basic salary of all foreign service officers eligible to retirement shall be contributed to the foreign service retirement and disability fund and the Secretary of the Treasury is directed on the date on which this act takes effect to cause such deductions to be made and the sums transferred on the books of the Treasury Department to the credit of the foreign service retirement and disability fund for the payment of annuities, refunds, and allowances: *Provided*, That all basic salaries in excess of \$9,000 per annum shall be treated as \$9,000.

(d) When any foreign service officer has reached the age of 65 years and rendered at least 15 years of service he shall be retired: *Provided*, That the President may, in his discretion, retain any such officer on active duty for such period not exceeding five years as he may deem for the interest of the United States.

(e) Annuities shall be paid to retired foreign service officers under the following classification, based upon length of service and at the following percentages of the average annual basic salary for the 10 years next preceding the date of retirement: Class A, 30 years or more, 60 per cent; class B, from 27 to 30 years, 54 per cent; class C, from 24 to 27 years, 48 per cent; class D, from 21 to 24 years, 42 per cent; class E, from 18 to 21 years, 36 per cent; class F, from 15 to 18 years, 30 per cent.

(f) Those officers who retire before having contributed for each year of service shall have withheld from their annuities to the credit of the foreign service retirement and disability fund such proportion of 5 per cent as the number of years in which they did not contribute bears to the total length of service.

(g) The Secretary of the Treasury is directed to invest from time to time in interest-bearing securities of the United States such portions of the foreign service retirement and disability fund as in his judgment may not be immediately required for the payment of annuities, refunds, and allowances, and the income derived from such investments shall constitute a part of said fund.

(h) None of the moneys mentioned in this section shall be assignable, either in law or equity, or be subject to execution, levy, or attachment, garnishment, or other legal process.

(i) In case an annuitant dies without having received in annuities an amount equal to the total amount of his contributions from salary with interest thereon at 4 per cent per annum compounded up to the time of his death, the excess of the said accumulated contributions over the said annuity payments shall be paid to his or her legal representatives; and in case a foreign service officer shall die without having reached the retirement age the total amount of his contributions with accrued interest shall be paid to his legal representatives.

(j) That any foreign service officer who before reaching the age of retirement becomes totally disabled for useful and efficient service by reason of disease or injury not due to vicious habits, intemperance, or willful misconduct on his part, shall, upon his own application or upon order of the President, be retired on an annuity under paragraph (f) of this section: *Provided, however*, That in each case such disability shall be determined by the report of a duly qualified physician or surgeon designated by the Secretary of State to conduct the examination: *Provided further*, That unless the disability be permanent, a like examination shall be made annually in order to determine the degree of disability, and the payment of annuity shall cease from the date of the medical examination showing recovery.

Fees for examinations under this provision, together with reasonable traveling and other expenses incurred in order to submit to examination, shall be paid out of the foreign service retirement and disability fund.

When the annuity is discontinued under this provision, before the annuitant has received a sum equal to the total amount of his contributions with accrued interest, the difference shall be paid to him or to his legal representatives.

(k) The President is authorized from time to time to establish, by Executive order, a list of places in tropical countries which by reason of climatic or other extreme conditions are to be classed as unhealthful posts, and each year of duty at such posts, while so classed, inclusive of regular leaves of absence, shall be counted as one year and a half, and so on in like proportion in reckoning the length of service for the purposes of retirement.

(l) Whenever a foreign service officer becomes separated from the service except for disability before reaching the age of retirement, 50 per cent of the total amount of contribution from his salary without interest shall be returned to him.

(m) Whenever any foreign service officer, after the date of his retirement, accepts a position of employment the emoluments of which are greater than the annuity received by him from the United States Government by virtue of his retirement under this act, the amount of the said annuity during the continuance of such employment shall be reduced by an equal amount: *Provided*, That all retired foreign service officers shall notify the Secretary of State once a year of any positions of employment accepted by them stating the amount of compensation received therefrom, and whenever any such officer fails to so report it shall be the duty of the Secretary of State to order the payment of the annuity to be suspended until such report is received.

(n) The Secretary of State is authorized to expend from surplus money to the credit of the foreign service retirement and disability fund an amount not exceeding \$5,000 for the expenses necessary in carrying out the provisions of this section, including actuarial advice.

(o) Any diplomatic secretary or consular officer who has been or any foreign service officer who may hereafter be promoted from the classified service to the grade of ambassador or minister, or appointed to a position in the Department of State, shall be entitled to all the benefits of this section in the same manner and under the same conditions as foreign service officers.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend in the RECORD the remarks I made upon this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The following committee amendments were severally reported and severally agreed to:

Page 10, line 22, after the word "force," insert the words "and such appropriations are hereby authorized."

Page 11, line 22, strike out the word "next," after the word "the," and insert the word "next," after the word "years."

Page 23, line 11, correct the spelling of the word "retirement."

Page 13, line 12, strike out the letter "f" in the parentheses and insert the letter "e."

Page 15, line 6, strike out the letter "m" in the parentheses and insert the letter "n."

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following committee amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts: Page 12, line 25, after the word "compounded," insert the word "annually."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following committee amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 15, line 17, at the end of subsection (o), insert new subsection, as follows:

"(p) For the purposes of this act the period of service shall be computed from the date of original oath of office as secretary in the Diplomatic Service, consul general, consul, vice consul, deputy consul, consular assistant, consular agent, commercial agent, interpreter, or student interpreter, and shall include periods of service at different times in either the Diplomatic or Consular Service, or while on assignment to the Department of State, or on special duty, but all periods of separation from the service and so much of any period of leave of absence as may exceed six months shall be excluded: *Provided*, That service in the Department of State prior to appointment as a foreign-service officer may be included in the period of service, in which case the officer shall pay into the foreign-service retirement and disability

fund a special contribution equal to 5 per cent of his annual salary for each year of such employment, with interest thereon to date of payment compounded annually at 4 per cent."

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to fix clearly, for the benefit of the comptroller, the exact moment at which an entrant into the foreign service shall be deemed to have become connected with the service. The provision in effect was included in the retirement section as it was passed by the House last year. I think the amendment simply gives effect to what would happen even if the language were not presented. It is intended merely to be a safeguard for the benefit of the comptroller.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Yes.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. As I caught the reading of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts, it includes anyone employed in the State Department.

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. It includes any foreign service officer who at any time was employed in the State Department.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I do not understand that the amendment is restricted enough. It says "anyone employed in the State Department." It may have been a janitor.

Mr. LEHLBACH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Yes.

Mr. LEHLBACH. I followed the reading very closely and I am familiar with provisions of this sort. The only persons in the service of the State Department who are covered are of two classes: One a diplomatic or consular officer who is assigned to the State Department, who is assigned to duty there, or a person who begins his diplomatic service as an employee of the State Department in the first place.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. That is, no doubt, the intention of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts, but the amendment is drawn in such a way that I doubt very much if that will be the construction, although I realize that I have not had time or opportunity to examine it closely. I would suggest the reading of it again, if there is no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent that the amendment be again reported. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will again report the amendment.

The amendment was again read.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I submit that the first two lines of the proviso are wide open:

Provided, That service in the Department of State prior to the appointment of a foreign-service officer may be included.

Service in the Department of State in what capacity? Any and all capacities.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Why should it not be so?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Service in the Department of State as a stenographer or doorkeeper?

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Why should not a doorkeeper be retired as well as anyone else?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Well, if that is the intention, that is another matter.

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. It relates only to the foreign-service officer, but it does not discriminate against the foreign-service officer who has risen from the ranks. It provides in a case of that sort that the beneficiary shall pay into the retirement fund 5 per cent of his salary.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. And regardless of the character of his employment before he went into the Diplomatic Service?

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] reserves a point of order.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that it is not germane to this paragraph of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman realizes that it has been debated for a considerable time.

Mr. BLANTON. I realize that; but I still make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I make the point of order, Mr. Chairman, that it is too late.

Mr. BLANTON. I make the point of order—

Mr. LONGWORTH. It is too late, because the chairman of the committee and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] have debated the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will enforce the rule. The Chair is disposed to overrule the point of order made by the gentleman from Texas.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BEEDY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I had an amendment pending, but I yield to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. BEEDY. I thank the gentleman very much. I wanted to offer this amendment: On page 14, line 15, strike out "50 per cent of."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maine.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BEEDY: Page 14, line 15, strike out the figures and words "50 per cent of."

Mr. BEEDY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee where the idea originated of inserting this provision, which operates in the way of a penalty on a man who contributed toward the retirement fund and for reasons other than disability left the service and is unable to avail himself of the benefits?

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. That amendment was not carried in the bill as I introduced it, and was adopted as the result of a rather elaborate discussion in the committee. The gentleman's point, I take it, is that it departs from the practice set forth in the Lehlbach law.

Mr. BEEDY. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House, we have a retirement fund from which the officers of the Army and Navy receive the benefits, a retirement fund to which they contribute not a dollar. Now, we are proposing a retirement fund for men who, in my humble opinion, are very much underpaid, and will be, even if this bill is passed. I think subsection (1) is not in keeping with the general purpose of the bill. I do not think it is fair, and I do not think that the men on this floor, if they give this matter a moment's thought, will want to vote to retain this section, which in practice operates as follows: Here is a man who has been in the foreign service. Five per cent of his pay has been taken from him to put into the retirement fund, but for some reason or other he leaves the service at the end of five years.

Perhaps he finds himself unable to keep abreast of his financial obligations under the salary which he is receiving. Now, then, are you going to say to that man, "We will take away from you half of all the money you have already paid into this retirement fund"?

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEEDY. Yes.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Has he not had during all of that five years the insurance of retirement and being continued in the service? Would it be fair to allow those people to only get something out of the Treasury and not put anything into that fund?

Mr. BEEDY. If I understand the gentleman, my answer would be this: Anybody, if this law goes into effect, who stays in the service 15 years would, of course, receive the benefit of the retirement fund, but in those cases of voluntary withdrawal prior to the 15-year period the Government has had the money paid into the retirement fund, and for the Government to take half of all the money which a man has contributed, if he sees fit to leave the service, does not seem to me to be in conformity with the general spirit of the bill, which, as I understand, is to treat the men in our foreign service decently.

Mr. BEGG. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEEDY. Yes.

Mr. BEGG. If the gentleman buys an insurance policy in public life anywhere and carries it for 5 years or 10 years and then decides to drop it, does the company pay back all the money that has been paid in or even return half of it?

Mr. BEEDY. On such life insurance as I hold I get more than half if I carry it more than three years.

Mr. BEGG. I would like to know the gentleman's company, because I would like to take out some insurance in that company.

Mr. BEEDY. If the gentleman will come to my office, I will let him read the policies.

Last summer I had occasion to visit 10 foreign countries, I was impressed with the high order of ability of the men in our foreign service, I was impressed with the fact that they were very greatly underpaid. I am very much in sympathy with

this bill, but it does not seem to me that this particular provision of it conforms to the general spirit of the bill. The House will be the better judge of that matter than I am, but I should like to see the matter brought to a vote.

Mr. LITTLE. Did I understand the gentleman to say he thought they were underestimated?

Mr. BEEDY. No; I said I thought they were underpaid.

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I think it only fair to say in this connection that this provision is in the bill more because of my insistence, perhaps, than because of the gentleman from Massachusetts. He was rather inclined to be against it, but I brought the proposition down to a straight business basis. I am not at all alarmed about these fellows in the Consular Service being imposed upon. I have a constituent in the Consular Service who is married and has two children. He prefers to have that job and live over there than to have a job in the United States. He stated to me that he could live over there better on the salary he is getting from the Government now—because this was before this bill was reported—than he could live back in Ohio on any salary that he could earn there.

Now, I am for the bill increasing the salaries of these men and I am for doing everything I can to stimulate trade, because trade is the life of the country. But why should you select a certain class of people and give them preferential gratuities in old age which are at the expense of the people who are not employed by the Government and who receive no gratuity? We do it for the Army and the Navy and I really think they ought to be compelled to pay something, yet with the Army and the Navy it is an entirely different proposition because there is more or less hazard there. But why should I get into the Consular Service and stay 5 years, 10 years, or 14 years, enjoy, if you please, insurance against old age and then leave the service of my own volition and receive what I have paid in, because I would no doubt leave the service on the presumption that I was bettering my condition or I would stay. Every kind of a condition is covered in the bill. If a man is discharged from the Government service for any reason that is covered, and if a man voluntarily quits the Government service, should the Government act as a savings bank for him and charge him no penalty? There is not a bank in the world that will do it for you, nor is there an insurance company in the world that will do it for you. The gentleman from Maine is absolutely wrong when he says there are insurance companies in the United States which will, if you drop your insurance, refund you even 50 per cent; they will not even refund you 10 per cent, nor 5 per cent, nor 1 per cent, and because they do not do that they can write cheaper insurance for the men who carry it.

Mr. BEEDY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEGG. Yes.

Mr. BEEDY. Lest there be any misunderstanding about it, did I understand the gentleman in his recent statement to imply that I am arguing that we ought to give back to a person leaving the service what he has contributed with interest.

Mr. BEGG. Well, if the gentleman's amendment succeeds, that is exactly what will be done. He puts in 5 per cent annually for 14 years, the Government compounds it annually, and then he quits to get a better job, and then the Government turns in all the money he has paid in for the insurance he has carried, plus 4 per cent compound interest.

Mr. BEEDY. If the gentleman will read the provision, he will find it provides for no interest. It is a special section and stipulates no interest.

Mr. BEGG. The gentleman only struck out the 50 per cent?

Mr. BEEDY. That is all.

Mr. MACLAFFERTY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEGG. Yes.

Mr. MACLAFFERTY. If a man has paid insurance for a certain length of time and then drops it, does not the gentleman know that while the company does not return him all or half the money it carries him on with paid-up insurance?

Mr. BEGG. Absolutely, and that is what is provided here. I am carrying him to the extent of 50 per cent.

Mr. MACLAFFERTY. The gentleman did not make that clear.

Mr. BEGG. Well, it is hard to make every point clear in a brief time.

If the gentleman's amendment succeeds, we provide these men with an annuity for life after retirement, or if they quit to take a better job before reaching the age of retirement under the gentleman's amendment we would give them back the total amount of their contribution from their salary

without interest. I was in error when I said we compounded it. We do not compound it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. BEGG. May I have just one more minute?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent to proceed for one additional minute. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BEGG. I do not want to misstate the facts. We do not compound the premium, but we return him all the premium. If the bill stays as it is, we penalize him 50 per cent of the premiums and refund the other 50 per cent, which I think is absolutely equitable and absolutely fair, and I hope the gentleman's amendment will not prevail.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maine.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I understand there are two more amendments to be offered, and I wonder if we could agree at this time, for the convenience of the committee, to close debate in 15 minutes, and I ask unanimous consent for that purpose.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The gentleman from Texas offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CONNALLY of Texas: Page 11, line 24, strike out the "60" and insert "40"; in line 25 strike out "54" and insert "30"; and on page 12, line 1, strike out "48" and insert "32"; and in line 2 strike out "42" and insert "28;" and in line 3 strike out "36" and insert "24," and in line 4, strike out "30" and insert "20."

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, this amendment proposes to reduce the scale of percentages on retirement by one-third as carried in the bill.

The bill carries increases of salary on the theory that persons in the Diplomatic and Consular Service should have more than sufficient to barely exist and that salaries provided would be fairly adequate for a decent and comfortable livelihood. By adding a liberal retirement feature the bill proposes to encourage these gentlemen to live up to every dollar of their salary. It is possible under this bill for a secretary who has been in the service for 30 years to retire on an annual compensation of \$5,400 per year. You gentlemen may think that is good public policy, but I believe that these rates are too high.

Gentlemen, you have heard on this floor this very afternoon retirements in the Army and the Navy cited as reasons why we should adopt this retirement provision in behalf of the foreign service. The gentleman from Maine stood here and said:

Why, the Army and the Navy have a retirement system and the Government pays all of it. Why should we not have a similar system for the foreign service?

If you adopt this provision in the bill you will simply be affording another precedent, and it will not be long until the clerks and the secretaries in the departments here in Washington and the secretaries of Congressmen will be at the doors of Congress wanting their retirement wages increased, and they will make their complaint with forcefulness when they call your attention to the fact you have adopted a bill making it possible for a secretary in the Diplomatic Service to retire and to draw out of the Public Treasury money raised by the sweat of the American taxpayers and give that secretary \$5,400 out of the Treasury, a secretary who neither sows nor does he reap; who neither tills nor does he spin. I want to say, my friends, that when you do that you will be encouraging every department in this Government—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. COLLINS. I yield the gentleman four minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman may proceed four additional minutes.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, let me tell you something: The Republican platform—and I am not making a partisan appeal, because the Democrats do it, too—the Republican platform proclaims the doctrine that you believe in economy, in rigid economy:

We pledge ourselves to a careful plan of readjustment to a peace-time basis and to a policy of rigid economy.

The Democratic platform pledges that kind of a policy. We go before the American people and you go before the American people and we tell them we are in favor of retrenchment. We believe in cutting people off the pay roll, we believe in rigid economy, and yet by this act, gentlemen, you are adding to the pay roll employees who retire from the service; and, mind you, you are not adding them to the rolls simply during your administration of four years, but you are adding them to the pay roll until Gabriel himself by a blast from his horn announces that their time for an accounting has come.

You are putting them on the pay roll, some of them at \$5,400 a year. Why, gentlemen, they will not have to entertain anyone after they retire. There will be no necessity for the retirement salary to be so high. If you are going to retire them, do not put them on a salary that, supplemented by their savings, will permit them to live in luxury, but give them a salary upon which they can get along comfortably.

Mr. LITTLE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Yes.

Mr. LITTLE. Does the gentleman say that these men get \$5,400?

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. That is the maximum.

Mr. LITTLE. Secretary of what?

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Embassies.

Mr. LITTLE. Has the gentleman offered an amendment?

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Yes; my amendment is to scale it down one-third. Of course, that is the maximum, but if only one gets \$5,400 that will be too much out of the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Yes; I yield to the statistician of Illinois.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. I will fortify my statement I made a while ago. Does the gentleman contend that the statement in the report as written on the basis of the bill that the Government will contribute only 1.94 of the salary is wrong?

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Yes; I contend that is wrong. All of these things were recommended and submitted by people who were in favor of the bill. I do not say that the estimates were willfully wrong, but I do say that all of these estimates were based on speculation and figures of actuaries, and the gentleman knows that there is no mathematical accuracy in those figures.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. I think we may take the figures of the actuaries.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Well I do dispute the statement that only 1.94 is contributed by the Government. If the gentleman will read the bill, he will see that it is provided the Government shall not pay any more toward the retirement fund than individuals contribute, which shows that the Government will pay half.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. That is only a safeguard.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. No; it is not.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 11, line 14, strike out the figures "65" and insert "70" and strike out all after the word "retired," in line 15, page 11.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi is recognized for one minute.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, the amendment I have offered simply makes the retirement age 70 instead of 65 and makes it conform to the civil service retirement law as it now stands.

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I shall not detain the committee for much of the five minutes that I reserved for myself. It is extremely difficult to get the precise cost of a retirement law. The Committee on Foreign Affairs realized that, but at the same time desired to go as far as it could go toward getting all information that was humanly possible. We consulted the board of actuaries which is administering the civil service retirement disability fund. Under date of January 7 we received the actuaries' report. They may have made mistakes, there may be a margin of errors, but I think we can say that they are more likely to guess right than anybody in the House or anybody outside. This is what they say:

The calculation indicates the contribution equal to 6.94 per cent of the salaries of all new employees will be sufficient to provide the benefits for employees entering the foreign service under the plan proposed in this bill. Employees' contributions at the rate of 5 per cent of their salaries will therefore cover 72 per cent of the normal

cost of the benefits and a contribution equal to 1.94 per cent of the salaries of new employees will be required by the Government in order to cover the remainder of the normal cost of the benefits.

In other words, gentlemen, the committee, by fixing a 5 per cent contribution under this section, provides that the contribution of the employees shall be at the rate of \$5 in comparison with every \$2 contributed by the Government. The effect of the Connally amendment would be that the Government would make a profit out of the salaries which it had been paying the officers.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Yes.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. The gentleman does not want to make a mistake; the most favorable testimony is that they would pay 72 and the Government 28 per cent.

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Seventy-two per cent of the cost would be paid by the employees and 28 per cent would be paid by the Government. The effect of the gentleman's amendment would be that by reducing annuities one-third the Government would make a profit out of the retirement fund. Considering the way we have established other retirement funds, that seems rather an absurd result.

We retire our Federal judges on full pay without contribution. We retire Army and Navy officers on three-quarters pay without contribution. Great Britain retires her foreign-service people on two-thirds pay without contribution. We retire our Coast Guard; we retire our Lighthouse Service; we retire pretty generally the employees of the Government without contribution. We retire the mass of civil-service employees of the Government on the basis of 2½ per cent contribution. The effect of the civil service retirement law—and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. LEHLBACH], the author of the law, will correct me if I am wrong—is that the Government pays 58 per cent of the benefits and the employees 42 per cent. At least it was so testified in the hearings. What we are asking in this provision is merely that the Government shall pay \$1.94 for every \$5 that is contributed by the employee.

Mr. LEHLBACH. The testimony shows that the cost of the retirement system as recommended in the bill will be 6.94 per cent of the pay roll. If that benefit is reduced two-thirds; that is, if the annuities are reduced by one-third, the cost of the annuities would be 4.64 per cent of the pay roll, and you are asking the employees to contribute 5 per cent, which is 0.32 of 1 per cent more than it costs.

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. In other words, my statement is verified, that the Connally amendment would result in a net profit to the Government.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. These calculations by the board of actuaries are based on specific terms not dependent at all upon longevity, and there seems to be no reason why there should be any mistake in the calculations.

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. They may be wrong, but they were as nearly right as we could get in the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired. All time has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CONNALLY of Texas) there were—ayes 21, noes 40.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi, Mr. COLLINS, which without objection the Clerk will again report.

The Clerk again reported the Collins amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 21. That the appropriations contained in Title I of the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice and for the judiciary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1925, and for other purposes," for such compensation and expenses as affected by the provisions of this act are made available and may be applied toward the payment of the compensation and expenses herein provided for, except that no part of such appropriations shall be available for payment of annuities to retired foreign-service officers.

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts: On page 16, line 7, after the word "judiciary" insert the words "and for the Departments of Commerce and Labor."

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, what is the purpose of that? Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The only purpose is to correct the title of the bill which we quote in this section. At the time this particular bill was reported it was not known what the exact title of that appropriation bill would be. Last year it comprised only two departments.

Mr. BLANTON. What is the necessity of adding the Departments of Labor and Commerce?

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. It is simply to correctly quote the title of that act.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. TEMPLE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend in the RECORD the remarks that I made on this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Is their objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. TILSON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 6357) for the reorganization and improvement of the foreign service of the United States, and for other purposes, and had directed him to report the same back with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments to final passage.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman moves the previous question on the bill and all amendments to final passage. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. That does not include the offer of a motion to recommit?

The SPEAKER. No. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put the amendments in gross. The question is on agreeing to the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I understood the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROGERS] said he would not try to pass the bill until to-morrow. I have not yet prepared my motion to recommit.

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I am willing to have it postponed until to-morrow. Mr. Speaker, will the bill come up to-morrow as the unfinished business if it is not passed to-night?

The SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. If we adjourn now a motion to recommit will be in order to-morrow?

The SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Speaker, there are a number of matters to be considered.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HAWES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for half an hour on Friday next.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent to address the House for half an hour on Friday next. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

NAVY DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. FRENCH rose.

Mr. UPSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House now for three minutes.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks he must first recognize the gentleman having in charge an appropriation bill or conference report. It has the right of way.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 6820) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1925, and for other purposes, disagree to all the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Idaho asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 6820, the naval bill, disagree to all the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference. Is there objection?

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the gentleman from Idaho a question with reference to the provision in the bill adopted by this House relating to enlistments under 21 years of age. I notice that the Senate has eliminated that amendment. Is there going to be a disposition on the part of the conferees just tamely to recede from the House position, or can we have assurance that the House will have an opportunity to vote on that when the bill comes back to the House?

Mr. FRENCH. I have no hesitation in letting the gentleman understand that we will give the opportunity desired.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. You will bring it back to the House before you agree to accept the Senate amendment?

Mr. FRENCH. Yes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER announced as conferees on the part of the House Mr. FRENCH, Mr. HARDY, Mr. TABER, Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina, and Mr. OLIVER of Alabama.

STOCK-RAISING HOMESTEADS

Mr. SINNOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill S. 381, insist on the amendments of the House, and agree to the conference asked for by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oregon asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill S. 381, insist on the House amendments, and agree to the conference asked for by the Senate. The Clerk will report the bill by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 381) to amend section 2 of the act entitled "An act to provide for stock-raising homesteads, and for other purposes," approved December 21, 1916 (39 Stat. L. p. 862).

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER announced as the conferees on the part of the House Mr. SINNOTT, Mr. SMITH, and Mr. RAKER.

GAUGES AND NATIONAL DEFENSE

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend in the RECORD my own remarks on the subject of gauges and their importance in national defense.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Connecticut asks unanimous consent to extend his own remarks in the RECORD on the subject indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, it is appropriate that the Representative in Congress from the New Haven, Conn., district should consider the subject of gauges and their relation to interchangeability in manufacture, for it was just outside the city limits of New Haven, and within a half mile of the place where the present Representative of that district now lives, that the principle of interchangeability of parts in manufacture was first practically worked out and applied in this country, and probably in the world. A letter written by Thomas Jefferson when he was minister to France, addressed to John Jay, states that a Frenchman by the name of Le Blanc had invented an improvement in the manufacture of muskets which "consists in making every part of them so exactly alike that what belongs to any one may be used for every other musket in the magazine." That the idea was not worked out and utilized, however, is shown in a later letter from Jefferson in which he states that he tried to get the United States to bring this Frenchman over, but failed and afterwards he lost track of him. I refer to this in order to give credit where credit is due for the idea, although, along with the originator of the idea, it seems to have been lost. At any rate, the principle of interchangeability of parts in manufacture was not used in France or any other country outside the United States until many years after it was in use here.

Eli Whitney, the inventor of the cotton gin, was probably the originator, and it is claimed quite confidently was the first to work out and practically apply the principle of interchangeability of parts in the manufacture of firearms. Although the cotton gin was one of the most important and far-reaching inventions of any age, the difficulties encountered in protecting his patent were so great that Whitney reaped almost no financial reward from it. We therefore find him turning to the manufacture of firearms, in which he was eminently successful. The great Winchester Repeating Arms Co. of to-day is the direct descendant of the small enterprise in which he embarked.

In 1798 an order for muskets was given by the War Department to the famous cotton-gin inventor, which were to be manufactured "on a new principle." Jefferson, in a letter to Monroe, written in 1801, in speaking of Whitney and his "new principle," says:

He has invented molds and machines for making the pieces of his locks so exactly equal that take 100 locks to pieces and mingle their parts and the 100 locks may be put together by taking the pieces which come to hand.

About 10 years elapsed before the order was fully completed, and the Government had to make a number of extensions of time for the completion of the order. Recalling the obstacles to be overcome 120 years later, during the World War, it is not to be wondered at that some delays were encountered in this pioneer undertaking. In connection with one of these extensions, Whitney brought to Washington all of the parts for the assembling of 10 complete muskets. The different parts of the musket were segregated into as many groups as there were parts in the musket. In the presence of the Secretary of War and other officials, Whitney performed what then appeared to be the most amazing feat of taking at random a part from each of the groups and assembling the parts into a complete musket. The exhibition seems to have been convincing. At any rate, the time was extended and he was allowed to finish the order.

That the Whitney muskets were more than satisfactory is well attested. In 1847 Jefferson Davis, then commanding a Mississippi regiment in the War with Mexico, wrote to the Ordnance Department that the steel-barreled muskets from the Whitney armory were "the best rifles ever issued to any regiment in the world."

In 1799 an order for pistols was given to Simeon North, of Middletown, Conn., and it is apparent from the result that before the completion of this order he used the same principle. It has been contended that North, and not Whitney, is entitled to first credit for this new principle. Unfortunately the papers, drawings, designs, and many other things which might give valuable information concerning the work of both Whitney and North along this line were destroyed by fire in their respective shops. It is quite probable, in view of the fact that the two pioneers along this line lived within 20 miles of each other, that ideas were exchanged between them; but from the records still extant it appears that Whitney used the "new principle" from the beginning, whereas in the case of North it does not affirmatively appear that he used it prior to 1808. In 1813 North contracted to furnish 20,000 pistols, and in the agreement appears this significant clause:

The component parts of the pistols are to correspond so exactly that any limb or part of one pistol may be fitted to any other pistol of the 20,000.

North's first contract with the Government was made in 1799, his last was finished in 1853, a year after his death, aggregating 50,000 pistols and more than 30,000 rifles. It has been said of him that he worked under 16 administrations, representing all parties, and that in all the 53 years he never received a reproof or a criticism of his work. He was a country-bred man, strong, quiet, and almost painfully modest. He lacked Whitney's education and influence, but, like him, he represented the best which American mechanical and business life has produced.

Without attempting to positively decide which of these two worthy sons of the same Commonwealth is entitled to the credit for originating or for the earliest development of the principle of interchangeability, it is sufficient to say that this principle, which has become of such tremendous importance in manufacturing, was during the first decade of the nineteenth century developed through the experimental stages by these two notable Connecticut men.

Whatever may have been the form or designation of the tools and other devices used in these early ventures, they were doubtless of a somewhat crude and primitive character. Their use, however, was the beginning of a chapter in American

history far more important than the threatened wars for which the muskets were to be made, which have been almost forgotten.

Interchangeability of parts and the devices necessary to insure interchangeability are preeminently American in their use and development. When the principle spread to Europe, as it did before the middle of the nineteenth century, it was universally characterized as the American system. The scarcity and high cost of labor in this country exerted a great influence in the development and use of such a principle. The increased use of labor-saving machinery accentuated development in this direction. In fact, it can be said that jigs and gauges, in connection with machinery, more than anything else, are responsible for the marvelous development of American manufacturing and for the ability of our manufacturers to successfully cope with foreign competition while paying much higher wages.

The primary credit for the development of the principle of interchangeability is due, as has been shown to the firearms industry, although its greatest application has been in the production of such articles as sewing machines, bicycles, typewriters, clocks, watches, and tools. The Ford automobile should also be mentioned as a conspicuous example. On account of the comparatively small quantities of military firearms required in this country development of the use of gauges in the manufacture of military firearms and other matériel did not keep pace with the development in the industries of peace. From the time that Whitney first used such devices, as he did in making interchangeable parts for muskets until shortly before the World War began, there had been a very great improvement in the character and quality of gauges and also an increase in their number and use, but not comparable with the development in lines of peaceful industry, so that when we entered the World War the supply of gauges and other precision and inspection devices, even for the most used of weapons, such as the Springfield rifle, was quite limited. For other important articles there were few or none.

It may not be generally known that up to 1916 no authority of law existed even for making appropriations for gauges, so that an item in an appropriation bill before Congress authorizing money to be spent for such a purpose would have had to go out of the bill on a point of order made against it. Early in 1916 I introduced a bill to authorize the War Department to manufacture and otherwise procure gauges, dies, jigs, tools, fixtures, and other special devices and appliances for the manufacture of arms, ammunition, and other matériel. When the national defense act of 1916 was under consideration in the House of Representatives I offered my bill as an amendment, and the amendment was carried as section 123 of the national defense act. In considering the development and present status of the gauge problem this section should have a place, so it is inserted here in full:

SEC. 123. Procurement of gauges, dies, jigs, etc., necessary for the manufacture of arms, etc. The Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized to prepare or cause to be prepared, to purchase or otherwise procure such gauges, dies, jigs, tools, fixtures, and other special aids and appliances, including specifications and detailed drawings as may be necessary for the immediate manufacture of arms, ammunition, and special equipment necessary to arm and equip the land forces likely to be required by the United States in time of war: *Provided*, That in the expenditure of any sums appropriated to carry out the purposes of this section the existing laws prescribing competition shall not govern whenever in the opinion of the Secretary of War such action will be for the best interests of the public service.

The story of what happened as a result of the new provision of law during the few months intervening between its enactment and our entrance into the war is short. The Army appropriation bill for 1917 and the fortifications bill, as well, carried appropriations under authority of the new provision. Very little was or could have been done owing to the lack of time before war was declared on April 6, 1917. The war found us with little except the law itself upon which to lay the foundation upon which was later constructed a great munitions program.

At the outset of the war it became apparent that the gauge problem was a determining factor as to the types and kinds of arms to be used in the struggle. I can best illustrate by taking one element of ordnance equipment as typical and going into it somewhat in detail. I therefore choose the shoulder rifle. For a few weeks after we entered the war there was some more or less pertinent discussion as to the kind of rifle with which the Infantry should be armed. A careful observation had been made of all the rifles in use by the allied forces, which only served to reinforce the general belief in this country that the United States Springfield, model 1903, was

superior to any other rifle in the war. It was the arm to which our small Regular Army and our National Guard had become accustomed and it was quite naturally desired that the emergency army to be raised should be armed with the same weapon. Lack of gauges caused the decision to use another rifle.

Soon after the United States had entered the war a conference of gauge manufacturers and rifle manufacturers was called to meet with the responsible officers of the Ordnance Department to discuss the subject of gauges as related to the production of rifles. Being greatly interested in the subject matter of the conference I secured the conference room in the House Office Building as the place of meeting and had the privilege of attending. Representatives of all the larger gauge manufacturers in this country were present and stated quite fully and clearly what could be counted upon in this direction. As a result of the conference it became apparent that for the bulk of our troops some other than the Springfield rifle must be adopted.

The situation as to rifles was that when we entered the war in 1917 we had on hand less than 700,000 Springfield rifles. As is well known, this arm is made only in Government arsenals. We had accumulated in the arsenals gauges of one type or another to such an extent that our capacity in rifle production was about 200,000 annually, although, of course, nothing like maximum production had ever been attempted. This capacity was quite sufficient in peace time, when all that was required was to replace wastage and very gradually increase the stock on hand. In war, however, such a capacity was not sufficient to even replace wastage; so that, relying upon this source alone, we must limit the Infantry forces to less than 700,000 rifles. Such increase in gauge capacity as was found to be practicable without seriously interfering with other features of the munitions program would have supplied little more than the inevitable wastage of war-time service. In this situation it was necessary to turn to sources outside of our Government arsenals, and here also the element of gauges was the decisive factor.

It was fortunate for the United States that necessity in a great emergency had compelled Great Britain to place very large orders for rifles with American manufacturers and that these manufacturers had equipped themselves with the gauges and other necessary tools for quantity production of an improved type of the British Enfield rifle. The practicability of using this equipment with slight modifications saved us from serious embarrassment in our rifle program.

The adoption of the improved British Enfield rifle—designated by us as the United States model 1917—as our principal reliance for the war is such an interesting illustration of the vital importance of gauges in any program of national defense that a brief reference to it is entitled to a place here. Prior to 1914 the British Ordnance Bureau had been engaged in designing a new rifle which was to take the place of the old Enfield. The new design was a decided improvement in many ways over the old one. It was to be .285 caliber instead of .303, as was and is now the caliber of the British rifle.

The new rifle, however, had not progressed beyond the blueprint stage when the war broke out. Any kind of rifle made of metal is superior to one on paper. Such rifles as were in existence were of the old type. Such facilities as existed for making rifles were of the old type. Such ammunition as was on hand fitted the old rifle, and such gauges, dies, and other necessary tools and equipment as existed for the production of rifles and ammunition were of the old type. Therefore, only one course was open to Great Britain and that was to continue making what could be made with existing facilities.

British agents brought drawings for their new rifle, modified so as to use .303 instead of .285 caliber ammunition, to this country and entered into contracts with such as could be induced to undertake its manufacture. The demand for rifles was pressing. At this stage of the British mobilization rifles were not available for more than 1 recruit in 10 enlisted. American manufacturers were urged to produce rifles with all possible speed. Time rather than money was the most essential element of the contracts.

The cry was rifles at the earliest possible moment, and then more rifles. Some of the strongest and best concerns in America took these contracts, companies with abundant capital and practically unlimited credit. Peace prevailed here; labor, both skilled and unskilled, was plentiful, and yet no rifles were produced for a whole year, the reason being the difficulty of the solution of the gauge problem.

The wrestling of American manufacturers with the gauge problem during the years 1915 and 1916 was a most instructive lesson in industrial preparedness for war. I watched and studied it with great interest and intensity, believing it to be

a most useful lesson for this country to learn. After a year's struggle with the problem, only a few rifles were being produced. Meanwhile much of the best blood of Great Britain was being shed that might have been saved, because of the lack of rifles. Eighteen months saw the number of rifles on the way toward France rapidly increasing, but more than two years of most precious time had passed before the 1915 orders for rifles had been filled. The rifles were hurried away to France, but the gauges and other necessary equipment which had been created for their production, and which had been paid for in British gold, remained and saved us from an embarrassing and dangerous situation.

We had entered the war and were now able to use the gauges and other equipment created for the purpose of meeting the dire need of Great Britain to likewise meet our own necessity. Comparatively slight modifications were necessary in order to produce a rifle that could use the United States service cartridge, but even this slight change, requiring only a few new gauges, held up the rifle program for months.

In the light of our war experience it is now possible to estimate about what time it would have required to create the necessary gauge capacity to have supplied rifles to our armies as they were mobilized and to make good the wastage. One thing is quite certain, and that is that if it had not been for the fortunate circumstance referred to more than two-thirds of the 2,000,000 men sent to France would have had to use the rifle of either France or Great Britain during their entire service.

Quite as good an illustration of the importance of gauges and the time required to procure them is furnished by the machine-gun problem. The Browning gun had been designed, made, and tested. It was a success. We were practically without machine guns of any kind, while the rapidly increasing importance of this arm was being daily demonstrated on the battle fields of France. The need for machine guns was most urgent. The Lewis gun, chambered for British ammunition, had been put into quantity production. The Marlin Co. had equipped itself for making a machine gun for Russia. These two might have been modified, as they were a little later, to use United States ammunition, and probably, in the light of subsequent events, should have been modified at once and manufactured in much greater numbers than they were, while the gauge problem for the Browning was being worked out. At any rate, with all possible effort concentrated on the Browning, it was a full year before these guns were being turned out in adequate quantities. Meanwhile our troops in France were inadequately supplied with such French and British machine guns as were available and with all the inconvenience and confusion attendant upon the use of the two kinds of Infantry ammunition in the same army.

The pistol problem furnished another forceful illustration of the same character, if one were needed. Our officers literally used such pistols as they could get, or went without, while the frantic, unceasing efforts of the Ordnance Department to procure the Colt automatic were rendered practically fruitless until almost the end of the war, by reason of the difficulties necessary to be overcome in working out the gauge problem.

Certain components of the artillery program would furnish almost as good illustrations as those already given of the difficulties encountered in trying to work out, in the midst of war, a problem which is peculiarly one of peace. Enough instances have been cited, however, to emphasize the vital importance of this problem in any rational or adequate program of national defense.

It is a work that can best be done in time of peace; in fact, can be done satisfactorily only in time of peace. A thorough study should be made of every essential component of matériel. Those necessitating the use of considerable gauge, jig, and fixture equipment, involving long time and special mechanical skill in manufacture, should be given priority of consideration. The goal should be an adequate reserve of such equipment, kept well up to date. Nothing short of this will satisfy the proper demands of a great country, which is entitled at all times to a reasonable degree of preparedness for its own defense.

It is a source of very great satisfaction that the Ordnance Department has tackled the problem in such a determined manner, indicating that it is not to be allowed to be lost sight of or sidetracked, but is to be worked out with vigor and persistence. The oncoming generations will soon forget the lessons of the Great War if allowed to do so. I trust that those who are charged with the responsibility of our national defense will see to it that at least the most vital of the lessons learned at such enormous cost are not forgotten.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock to-morrow.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock to-morrow. Is there objection?

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, may I ask the gentleman from Ohio what business will be taken up?

Mr. LONGWORTH. We wish to conclude the consideration of the District of Columbia appropriation bill. It could not be done, probably, unless we began at 11 o'clock.

Mr. BLANTON. I hope the gentleman will not do that.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I have been requested to submit the request by members of the committee.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. I think if the Republican Congress wants to work we should let it work.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I think that is admirable.

Mr. BLANTON. We have a lot of work to do, Mr. Speaker. I have a lot of work to do on that particular bill. I hope the gentleman will not insist on that.

Mr. LONGWORTH. There are a number of gentlemen on the subcommittee and others, together with the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, who have asked me to make that request.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. ALLEN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I would not object if the Members would come at the hour, but when you say 11 o'clock and then meet really at 12 o'clock, I do not see any necessity for it.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. ALLEN. I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from West Virginia objects.

REPORT FROM COMMITTEE ON ENROLLED BILLS

Mr. ROSENBLOOM, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that this day they had presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, bill of the following title:

H. R. 1831. An act to loan to the College of William and Mary, in Virginia, two of the cannon surrendered by the British at Yorktown on October 19, 1781.

REREFERENCE

The SPEAKER. H. R. 7217, a bill for the purchase of the Oldroyd collection of Lincoln relics and the erection of a monument or tablet to mark the spot where Lincoln died, was referred by the Chair to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. Request had been made that it be transferred to the Committee on the Library, and the chairmen of both committees agree to the rereference. If there is no objection, the Chair will rerefer it to the Committee on the Library.

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to—

Mr. McCLINTIC (at the request of Mr. McKEOWN) for an indefinite time, on account of illness.

Mr. WATKINS, indefinitely, on account of sickness.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 39 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, May 1, 1924, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

447. Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, a communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1925, for rent of offices for the recorder of deeds, \$6,800 (H. Doc. No. 252), was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. SNELL: Committee on Rules. H. Res. 274. A resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 5478, a bill to

amend an act providing vocational rehabilitation of persons injured in civil employment; without amendment (Rept. No. 602). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SNELL: Committee on Rules. H. Res. 275. A resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 5209, a bill to provide additional hospital facilities for the Veterans' Bureau; without amendment (Rept. No. 603). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LUCE: Committee on the Library. S. J. Res. 7. A joint resolution granting permission for the erection of a monument to symbolize the national game of baseball; without amendment (Rept. No. 604). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. LUCE: Committee on the Library. S. J. Res. 106. A joint resolution authorizing the erection on public grounds in the city of Washington, D. C., of an equestrian statue of Gen. San Martin which the people of Argentina have presented to the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 605). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. QUIN: Committee on Military Affairs. S. J. Res. 105. A joint resolution authorizing the President to detail an officer of the Corps of Engineers as Director of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 606). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5420. A bill to provide fees to be charged by clerks of the district courts of the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 607). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5422. A bill to provide for reporting and accounting of fines, fees, forfeitures, and penalties, and all other moneys paid to or received by clerks of United States courts; without amendment (Rept. No. 608). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5421. A bill to relieve United States district judges from signing an order admitting, denying, or dismissing each petition for naturalization; without amendment (Rept. No. 609). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5423. A bill to amend section 2 of the act of August 1, 1888 (25 Stat. L., p. 357); with an amendment (Rept. No. 610). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2236. An act to designate the time and places of holding terms of the United States district court in the first division of the district at Kansas City; without amendment (Rept. No. 611). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MCKENZIE: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 8896. A bill providing for sundry matters affecting the Military Establishment; without amendment (Rept. No. 612). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 3847. A bill granting a certain right of way, with authority to improve the same, across the old canal right of way between Lakes Union and Washington, King County, Wash.; with amendments (Rept. No. 615). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts: Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 8638. A bill to amend section 28 of the merchant marine act, an act of 1920; with an amendment (Rept. No. 617). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIII,

Mr. UNDERHILL: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3071. A bill for the relief of Daniel A. Spaight; with an amendment (Rept. No. 613). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3132. A bill for the relief of the William J. Oliver Manufacturing Co. and William J. Oliver, of Knoxville, Tenn.; without amendment (Rept. No. 614). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 7389. A bill for the relief of John Solen; without amendment (Rept. No. 616). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7217) for the purchase of the Oldroyd collection of Lincoln relics and the erection of a monument or tablet to mark the spot where Lincoln died, and the same was referred to the Committee on the Library.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DOYLE (by request): A bill (H. R. 8977) to provide for the furnishing of surety bonds by national banks for the protection of depositors; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BRAND of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 8978) to amend the Federal highway act; to the Committee on Roads.

By Mr. DALLINGER: A bill (H. R. 8979) authorizing the extension and operation of the transcontinental airplane mail service to Boston, Mass.; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 8980) to incorporate the National American War Mothers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRAND of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 8981) to establish standard weights for loaves of bread, to prevent deception in respect thereto, to prevent contamination thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BLACK of Texas: A bill (H. R. 8982) exempting farmers' or other mutual hail, cyclone, casualty, life, or fire insurance companies, mutual or cooperative telephone companies, or like organizations from corporation taxes under Title III, under certain conditions, and providing for the abatement, credit, or refund of such taxes under prior acts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RAKER: A bill (H. R. 8983) to prohibit the importation of meats, hides, hair, bones, or other parts of cattle, horses, sheep, goats, or swine until January 1, 1925, from certain countries where the foot-and-mouth disease is prevalent; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HUDDLESTON: A bill (H. R. 8984) to prevent frauds in commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LEAVITT: Resolution (H. Res. 276) for the appointment of a select committee to inquire into the need and form of a nation-wide system for the distribution of labor and to report thereon, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HUDDLESTON: Resolution (H. Res. 277) to investigate the Cleveland Passenger Terminal scheme; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BACHARACH: A bill (H. R. 8985) granting a pension to Annie L. Robinson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 8986) granting a pension to Nettie Truman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CROLL: A bill (H. R. 8987) granting a pension to Ida L. Walters; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: A bill (H. R. 8988) for the relief of Elmer White; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8989) for the relief of Henry Juvenile; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT: A bill (H. R. 8990) granting a pension to Martha Abernathy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8991) granting an increase of pension to Ada M. Standish; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KUNZ: A bill (H. R. 8992) to correct the military record of Daniel D. Dorsey; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8993) to correct the military record of Rocco Pecora; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LOZIER: A bill (H. R. 8994) granting a pension to Reuben J. Allen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PATTERSON: A bill (H. R. 8995) granting an increase of pension to Ida J. Black; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RAGON: A bill (H. R. 8996) for the relief of John Zachary; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ROACH: A bill (H. R. 8997) for the relief of Mrs. G. A. Guenther; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8998) to provide payment of war risk insurance policy of Ensign Gordon Guenther to his mother, Mrs. G. A. Guenther; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SANDERS of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 8999) granting a pension to Anna C. Piatt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SITES: A bill (H. R. 9000) granting an increase of pension to Allen R. Read; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SPROUL of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 9001) granting a pension to William J. Braseer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9002) granting a pension to Louise H. Rush; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9003) granting a pension to Susan Stanart; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STALKER: A bill (H. R. 9004) granting a pension to Lydia H. Squires; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SWANK: A bill (H. R. 9005) for the relief of Pleasant H. Sells; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SWING: A bill (H. R. 9006) authorizing the appointment of Kenneth K. Little as second lieutenant, United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TABER: A bill (H. R. 9007) granting a pension to Patrick H. Bushnell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TINKHAM: A bill (H. R. 9008) granting a pension to Lewis B. Jones; to the Committee on Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2606. By the SPEAKER (by request): Petition of Massachusetts Society, Sons of the American Revolution, asking that authorization be granted for the complete restoration and repairing of the frigate *Constitution* at the Charlestown Navy Yard; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

2607. Also (by request), petition of Advertising Men's Post, No. 38, American Legion, Department of Illinois, urging the President of the United States to sign the Johnson immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

2608. Also (by request), petition of the preachers' meeting of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Baltimore and vicinity, requesting the Congress of the United States to reconsider the subject of immigration as affects Japan; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

2609. By Mr. ANDREW: Petition of the Massachusetts Society, Sons of the American Revolution, petitioning Congress to grant authorization and appropriate funds for the complete restoration and repairing of the frigate *Constitution* at the Charlestown (Mass.) Navy Yard, so that it may be preserved as a priceless memorial of the heroism of the United States Navy; to the Committee on Appropriations.

2610. By Mr. FULLER: Petition of the American Federation of Railroad Workers, Railroad Harbor and Terminal Workers, Lodge No. 342, Jersey City, protesting against the passage of the Howell-Barkley bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2611. Also, petitions of sundry citizens of Streator, Ill., favoring the Edge bill (S. 1524) to modify the Volstead Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2612. Also, petitions of the Rockford (Ill.) Malleable Works and the Rockford Lumber & Fuel Co., opposing any change in the existing transportation act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2613. Also, petition of the Rockford (Ill.) Manufacturers & Shippers' Association, protesting against abolishing the present labor board as proposed by the bills S. 2646 and H. R. 7358; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2614. By Mr. GALLIVAN: Petition of National Legislative and Information Bureau, Washington, D. C., recommending a "fair consideration of the Barkley-Howell bill on its merits"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2615. By Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois: Petition of Mrs. James A. Allen and others, of Aledo, Ill., favoring Senate Joint Resolution 64; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

2616. Also, petition of Tri-City Typographical Union, No. 107, of Rock Island, Ill., favoring the early passage of the 2.75 per cent beverage bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2617. By Mr. RAKER: Petition of Leaf Spring Manufacturers' Association, Richmond, Ind., calling attention to inadequate law in regard to rulings of Bureau of Internal Revenue; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2618. Also, petition of Pasadena Ice Co., Pasadena, Calif., in re Senate bill 624, opposing enactment of same into law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2619. Also, petition of M. L. Ryder, 5117 Mount Helena Avenue, Eagle Rock, Calif., opposing Howell-Barkley bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2620. Also, petitions of A. R. Dora, 1619 Whitefield Road, Pasadena, Calif., opposing Howell-Barkley bill abolishing Railway Labor Board; C. L. Herbst, 198 Live Oak Street, Los Angeles, Calif., and William A. Clark, 5407 Ash Street, Los Angeles, Calif., opposing Howell-Barkley bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2621. Also, petitions of D. M. Bassi, Lotus, Calif., and Nevada County Farm Bureau, Grass Valley, Calif., opposing increase in parcel-post rates; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

2622. By Mr. SITES: Petition of Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Shiremanstown, Pa., opposing any modification of the Volstead Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2623. Also, petition of members of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union and the different churches of Bowling Springs, Pa., protesting against any modification of the Volstead Act which would legalize the sale of light wines and beer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

THURSDAY, May 1, 1924

(Legislative day of Thursday, April 24, 1924)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

The principal clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Bayard	Dill	Keyes	Sheppard
Brookhart	Ferris	King	Shortridge
Broussard	Fess	McKinley	Simmons
Bursum	Frazier	McLean	Smoot
Capper	Gooding	Neely	Stephens
Cummins	Hale	Oddie	Warren
Curtis	Harris	Overman	Willis
Dale	Howell	Phipps	
Dial	Jones, Wash.	Reed, Pa.	

Mr. CURTIS. I wish to announce that the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] is absent on account of illness. I ask that this announcement may stand for the day.

I was requested to announce that the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD], and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] are absent attending a committee meeting.

I was also requested to announce that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. NORBECK], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. RANSDELL], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. KENDRICK], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CARAWAY], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. RALSTON] are absent attending a hearing before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. KING. I desire to announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ADAMS] is detained at a meeting of the Committee on Public Lands.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Thirty-four Senators have answered to their names. There is not a quorum present. The Secretary will call the roll of absentees.

The principal clerk called the names of the absent Senators, and the following Senators answered to their names when called:

Glass	Pittman	Smith	Walsh, Mass.
Lodge			

The following Senators entered the Chamber and answered to their names:

Bruce	Ernst	George
-------	-------	--------

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Forty-two Senators have answered to their names. There is not a quorum present.

Mr. SMOOT. I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Sergeant at Arms will execute the order of the Senate.

After some delay the following Senators entered the Chamber and answered to their names:

Ball	Edge	Johnson, Calif.	Stanley
Brandegee	Harreld	Mayfield	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Forty-nine Senators have answered to their names. There is a quorum present. Without objection, the further execution of the order to the Sergeant at Arms will be dispensed with.

M. S. DAUGHERTY

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a communication from the Sergeant at Arms, which the Secretary will read.

The reading clerk read as follows:

SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES,
Sergeant at Arms, April 30, 1924.

Hon. ALBERT B. CUMMINS,

President pro tempore, United States Senate.

SIR: In pursuance of the order of the Senate dated April 26, 1924, commanding me to forthwith arrest and take into custody and bring to the bar of the Senate M. S. Daugherty, president of the Midland National Bank, Washington Court House, Ohio, I did, acting through my deputy, John J. McGrain, on April 28, 1924, at 3 o'clock p. m., arrest and take Mr. Daugherty into custody.

I was, however, prevented from bringing him to the bar of the Senate by the action of the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Ohio, western division, at Cincinnati, in granting a writ of habeas corpus upon the application of Mally S. Daugherty, and setting the case for hearing on Saturday, May 10, 1924, at 8.30 o'clock a. m. The court further ordered that the said petitioner, Mally S. Daugherty, be released upon his own recognizance in the sum of \$5,000, conditioned to appear at the time, place, and hour stated.

Respectfully,

DAVID S. BARRY.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The communication will lie on the table for such action as the Senate may desire to take.

Mr. BROOKHART subsequently said: Mr. President, I offer a resolution with reference to the report from the Sergeant at Arms laid before the Senate this morning, and I ask for its present consideration.

The resolution (S. Res. 218) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Whereas under Senate Resolution No. 157 the special committee appointed to investigate the conduct of the office of Attorney General Harry M. Daugherty and his assistants did summon M. S. Daugherty to appear before it in person and to produce certain books and papers at room 410, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C., which summons he disregarded, and the Senate thereupon ordered the arrest of said M. S. Daugherty, which order was executed by the Deputy Sergeant at Arms. Thereupon the said M. S. Daugherty procured a writ of habeas corpus in the United States District Court of the Southern District of Ohio, the same being assigned for hearing at Cincinnati, Ohio, on May 10, 1924; and

Whereas the said committee did summon said M. S. Daugherty to appear before a subcommittee in person at Washington Court House, Ohio, which summons he disregarded, and thereupon brought an injunction suit in the Ohio court of common pleas in said city against SMITH W. BROOKHART and BURTON K. WHEELER, said subcommittee, requiring them to answer on May 10, 1924:

Resolved, therefore, That the President of the United States be respectfully requested to direct the Attorney General to defend said suits on behalf of the Senate of the United States.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Mr. WARREN presented a letter in the nature of a memorial from the committee on marketing of the Business Men's Club of Moorcroft, Wyo., remonstrating against a proposed readjustment of parcel-post rates, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. LADD presented a resolution of the Commercial Club of Aneta, N. Dak., favoring the passage of the so-called McNary-Haugen export corporation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. LODGE presented a resolution of the City Council of Brockton, Mass., favoring the passage of legislation granting increased compensation to postal employees, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. JOHNSON of California presented a petition of sundry citizens of Long Beach, Calif., praying an amendment to the Constitution granting equal rights to women, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.